

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

SOONER or later every preacher has to face the problem of suffering. His business is the 'cure of souls,' and of every congregation it may be said, in the words of the evening hymn, 'some are sick and some are sad.' The sadness may spring from many causes, from personal failure or loss of friends or the slow progress of the world towards the noble life: but in sensitive souls that sadness is sure to arise also at the contemplation of pain and suffering. Much of it seems so needless, some of it even so unjust: what is the preacher to say to it?

He will speak of it to most purpose, if he speaks of it from within; that is, if he has himself been smitten, body and soul, with the pain and suffering whose meaning it is his business to interpret to others. But, even without any profound personal experience of suffering, he cannot have used his eyes or his heart to much purpose if he has not been touched to sorrowful questioning by the things he may see almost any day not only in the human but in the sub-human world. One day three baby thrushes are sleeping peacefully in their nest, the next they are torn from it by a cat and mutilated beyond recognition. The sensitive heart is stunned by so lurid a revelation of a 'nature red in tooth and claw'; and crueller still are the waste and pain in the human world.

enough or blind enough. The world is a very attractive place, when all the ugly facts are shut off: if you do not know of them, or if you close your eyes to them, the system of things is pleasant enough. But these things are there, whether you see them or not, and any optimism which has a right to exist must reckon with them. But there is a pessimism which is just as shallow as some optimisms, a pessimism which is as blind to the joy that is set before us and around us as optimism may be blind to the tragedies. Both pessimism and optimism may be purely sentimental and temperamental, and our only reasonable reconciliation with the world comes from seeing it steadily and seeing it whole.

This is what Professor W. Cosby BELL, D.D., does in his Bohlen Lectures on *Sharing in Creation*, noticed elsewhere in this number. His chapter on 'The Problem of Suffering' treats this world-old theme with considerable freshness. He reminds us, to begin with, that there is another side to the picture. 'Outside the window the bird is singing in the tree-top his full-throated melody of the joy of life, even though the shadow of the bird-hawk may presently still his song. "I vote for life," he seems to say, "even if there is a hawk in it." Inside the chamber the baby is splashing in his tub, and the mother remembereth no more her anguish for joy that a man is born into the world. Friendship

and love are at their daily work of enriching human existence; journeys end in lovers' meetings; and old men, with one foot in the grave, creep about taking an undefeated joy in one more day of life.'

To rail indiscriminately at suffering, he points out, is to assume that suffering has no value, and that the end of human life is happiness. But these are the very things to be proved. The whole course of experience, however, goes to suggest that the end of life is not happiness but a progressive enrichment of character, and to this end suffering can make a notable contribution. Many of the finest qualities which it is possible for human nature to exhibit could never come into being at all, were it not that the world in which we are set is a dangerous world. If Nature seems at times remorseless, it is not that she is really unfriendly or even indifferent; the very sternness of the demands she makes upon us is a proof that she means well by us. She will not be content with any flabby response on our part, still less with evasion—these things she will punish; but she invites us to conquer her, that by our victory over her we may win our own souls. The padded and the cushioned life were no life at all for a creature worth calling a man.

Or, as Dr. BELL puts it, 'a world in which no one could possibly get hurt, in which hunger always found food waiting at its elbow, in which ignorance carried no penalties and wisdom brought no rewards, in which carelessness and energy stood on an equal survival footing, might be a pleasant enough change for a week or so, but it may be doubted whether it would be good for us. It may even be doubted whether we should like it for any length of time. We might find that Elysium was but another name for boredom.' So the very system which seems callous to personal values is found in the end to nurture them, if only a heroic response is made to it.

Suffering has also its socializing effect. Joy brings men together, but not into so intimate a

bond as sorrow. It is a commonplace that, when destitution invades the homes of the poor, their neighbours, only less poor than themselves, relieve their need with an abounding generosity; and sorrow has been known to bring an ancient feud to an end. Any experience can legitimate its claim to a place in the world-order which thus opens the flood-gates of mercy and pity.

Again, there is the faith which we cherish, at any rate in our deeper moments, that the brave and resolute endurance of whatever life may bring bears fruit somewhere, as William James says, 'in an unseen spiritual world'; the sense that this life is a real fight in which something is eternally gained for the universe by success. More particularly can the Christian, who knows that he is not alone in his fight, believe that there is no accident that is irremediable and no disaster that is irretrievable. By the help of God he has learned the art of transmuting the stern material of life, and with patience and hope he 'works the worst over into the best.'

It is by no means the lives most exposed to sternness and hardship that are always the saddest, often it is the very reverse. With the sorrow and the pain may go a joy unspeakable, the joy of experience no less than of hope. Dr. BELL skilfully concludes his argument by placing together two well-known utterances of Paul: that in 2 Co 11, where with moving eloquence he describes the hardships of his missionary life; and the other in Ph 4^{10ff}, where he speaks of his abounding joy in the Lord. 'Thrice was I beaten with rods, once was I stoned, thrice I suffered shipwreck, a night and a day have I been in the deep. But I rejoice in the Lord greatly, for I have learned, in whatsoever state I am, therein to be content. I can do all things in him that strengtheneth me.' Such a confession, welling out of an experience so stern, is the everlasting rebuke of pessimism.

In one aspect of it, *Christ's Gospel of the Eternal and the Divine Manifestation in Christ*, by the Rev.

W. L. WALKER, D.D. (T. & T. Clark ; 7s. 6d. net), is a plea for honesty in religious thought. It is not only, or chiefly, intellectual difficulties that prevent men from becoming followers of Jesus ; yet the traditional statement of the Christian creed puts unnecessary stumbling-blocks in the way of very many.

First of the difficulties, not inherent in Christianity but only in our statement of it, is the assertion that 'Christ is God.' Of this phrase Dr. Denney once wrote that he avoided it because it is one of those provocative ways of speaking that challenge contradiction. For him it was objectionable in the same way as the title 'Mother of God' applied to Mary.

To insist that a Christian profession involves acceptance of this formula is to alienate very many in Christian lands who would gladly be disciples of the Jesus of the Synoptic Gospels but to whom the Christ of the creeds is a stranger. It is not so much that they *will not* as that they *can not* bring themselves to think in this way. There are, too, millions of peoples of other faiths who are ready to confess Jesus as their Lord and to acknowledge His Divine humanity, but who, by their inability to say 'Jesus is God,' believe themselves to be shut out of the fold.

By their fruits ye shall know them, and this doctrine must be judged by its fruits, by *all* its fruits ; and one of these is that it has been a divisive force since first it was promulgated. It alienated the monotheistic Jews ; it gave opportunity to Muhammad to come forth as a prophet of the one true God, and it was largely responsible for the rise and spread of Islam, whose enmity to Christianity has been so difficult to overcome. 'It led to bitter feelings, to excommunications, to persecutions, to strife and bloodshed, and even to open wars of Christians against Christians,' 'and not without the strong hand of force did it prevail.'

May it not even be that one of the causes of the

world war was that the popular revolt against this doctrine, in Germany for example, unaccompanied by any successful attempt to find a more satisfactory statement on the Person of Christ, became a revolt against Christianity itself ? There are, it is true, certain difficulties inherent in Christian belief, and difficulties have to be faced, not evaded. But Dr. WALKER's contention is, that when for the early Christian formula 'Jesus is Lord' we substitute the later 'Jesus is God,' it is we who create the difficulty for ourselves.

For the later formula is not taken from the New Testament. Formerly it was believed to receive support from the Fourth Gospel ; but, quite apart from the question whether the speeches of Jesus in that Gospel are literal records of actual utterances of Jesus, 'John' says that 'God was the Logos' ; he does not say that 'the Logos was God.' The same Jesus who says, 'I and my Father are one,' also says, 'The Father is greater than I.'

Is Dr. WALKER, then, a Unitarian ? We increasingly dislike theological labels, and that one would certainly be inapplicable. What he is arguing for is a return to something like the New Testament attitude to Jesus. He suggests this line of thought : If Jesus was the revelation of God, how can He also be the God whose revelation He was ? Have we not a sufficiency of New Testament phrases in which to express our reverence and adoration for Jesus ? 'Jesus is the Christ,' 'Jesus is God's Son,' 'Jesus is Lord.' Dr. Haering has said that many who would be troubled by a revival of ancient metaphysical terms find comfort and peace in the simple thought of Jesus as Lord.

But do not most of the New Testament titles of Jesus need interpretation ? Take 'Son of God' for example. In connexion with the Sonship of Jesus what we are asked to stress is not the precise sense in which Jesus was Son, but the fact that in Him, as nowhere else, the Father was revealed. Throughout history God was working towards a certain goal,

Jesus was Son of God, Dr. Walker believes, not in the sense that He was miraculously created in the womb of a virgin, but in the sense that God's eternal purpose was first fully realized in Him. The Incarnation was not an act but a process, the process by which what God is in relation to man was ever more and more fully expressed until it found perfect utterance in Jesus.

This also is what Dr WALKER understands by the pre-existence of Christ. The individual, human Jesus did not exist in and with God from all eternity—would Paul have asserted that He did? The 'Son in God' to whom the Divine love eternally went forth was the Divine ideal and goal of the Creation; that Divine, creative ideal, always real for the eternal Mind, became incarnate in Jesus.

One of the most urgent practical problems of to-day is the proper observance of the Lord's Day. It is not only a problem of practice. It is more. It has bearings on the religious life of our land. And it raises questions as to the proper interpretation of Scripture and the real authority of the Old Testament. In this country Sunday has always been more or less a day of rest. And in this matter continental nations have cast longing eyes at our practice and made tentative efforts to imitate it. In Belgium, for example, when you buy a postage stamp you find on it a tear-off piece with the words 'ne pas livrer de Dimanche,' and if you wish to take part in the national movement for a quiet Sunday you post your letter with the full stamp. If not, you tear off the milled part.

The practice, however, has in recent times been largely changed. While continental lands have been striving to approach our custom, we have been approaching theirs. Sunday golf, Sunday tennis, Sunday theatres, Sunday outings, have spread far and wide. This new habit has been adopted in the name of freedom and in reaction from a former over-strictness. People have fallen in with the new ways without knowing well why they do

so. What is most formidable in the 'modern' Sunday is not its looseness, but the fact that people have no convictions on the point. They simply follow their inclinations. And to-day it is largely true that the average Christian does not know why and how he should keep the Lord's Day as a special day.

What adds to his perplexity is that the observance of the day is often placed on the wrong ground, which he knows to be wrong. It is based on the authority of the Fourth Commandment. Now we all know that nobody obeys the Fourth Commandment. It enjoins the seventh day, but we keep the first. After our Lord's death the Christian Church abandoned the seventh day and substituted the first as the festival of the Lord's resurrection. Also, there are few people even among ourselves who do no work on the sacred day. These may seem small points, but the issue is the literal obedience to the commandment, and that obviously no one gives. It may be said that what we are to keep is the substance of the law. But what is the *substance*? That is the question we have to settle, and how are we to settle it?

Clearly on such an issue the real and only authority is our Lord's teaching. For Christians that is final. For others the question does not arise. Now that teaching may be found in three definite directions: first, in His explicit words about the Sabbath, second, in His practice, and third, in His general directions for conduct.

His great utterance on the Sabbath question was that the Sabbath was made for man. This clearly means for man's benefit, and we may interpret that as including his physical, mental, and spiritual benefit. The benefit to his body is rest; the benefit to his mind and soul is refreshment. Also, Christ looked upon the day as a *separate* day, a day with different uses and different aims from other days. His practice shows that He believed one of these uses was worship. He went to church habitually ('as his practice was, he entered the Synagogue'). It must be obvious that to our

Lord the Sabbath was given as a day on which the fountain of our spiritual life should be replenished in God's House.

But when we are considering Christian practice on any point we must not leave out the general teaching of our Lord. And for one good reason. He never legislated. He never laid down particular injunctions. He stated principles, and then said to His followers, 'Go and put these into practice in the spirit of my life and teaching.' But He gave very definite guidance on principles. And one of these principles that bear on the question of the keeping of Sunday is the great 'Commandment,' to love our neighbour as we love ourselves.

Now, how does this teaching of Jesus, given in these three ways, afford us help in the problem? Well, it says to us that we must keep this day as a separate day, devoted to special ends. Further, it says to us that the day is given us for the refreshment of our faith, for deepening our life in God. Again, it says to us, 'You must not do anything on the Lord's Day that would harm your neighbour, or take from *him* the blessing the day was meant to give.' All this means that the day was not given for work, and that we must avoid, so far as possible, doing anything that would make it a work-day for others.

Does not Christ's teaching, thus interpreted, if we have interpreted it aright, give us sound guidance about the practical points that arise, about Sunday games, and travelling, and amusements? There

may be nothing wrong in tennis and golf on Sunday in *themselves*. Indeed, they have been defended as a real refreshment to people shut up all week in offices and shops. That argument is now worn thin, for, since early closing and the universal half-holiday, practically nobody is shut up all week. Everybody has evenings and a half-day on Wednesday or Saturday. What, then, is to be said of Sunday games? This, that though they may do no harm to *you*, they break down the separateness of the day and tend to destroy its special character and the possibility of its special blessings. And they involve the compulsory labour of others, in some cases to a large extent.

To sum up, according to the mind of Jesus, as we understand it, we have in the matter a threefold duty, a duty to ourselves, a duty to others, and a duty to God, and we do not use the Lord's Day as He would have us use it, unless we try to fulfil each part of this threefold duty. This does not mean that we are to restore the Puritan Sabbath or even the Jewish Sabbath, though it is a sheer delusion to think that the Jewish Sabbath was a burden, at least in Old Testament days. The teaching of Jesus is liberating, here as in all else. We may be true to His spirit, His practice, and His principles, and find the first day of the week the best and most joyous of all. But we must not forget God, or our neighbour, or our own best self. If the day has been an unspeakable blessing to the world, we ought to see to it that what has been great and gracious in it is preserved and handed on for the benefit of the generation to come.

Recent Thought on the Doctrine of Immortality.

BY THE REVEREND W. R. MATTHEWS, D.D., DEAN OF KING'S COLLEGE, LONDON.

THE subject of immortality and the future life has been much cultivated in recent years, and no doubt the war gave a great impulse to reflection and inquiry. It would scarcely be true to say that any remarkably new line of thought has been

discovered, but the old methods of approach have been re-examined and tested in the light of accumulating knowledge, particularly in psychology. Several important works which attempt to survey the whole question have appeared. Two among

them deserve particular mention, Pringle Pattison's *Idea of Immortality* and Tsanoff's *Problem of Immortality*. The former carries further the positions defended and explained with so much skill in the *Idea of God*; the latter gives a lucid account of the more salient contributions of thinkers, and surveys the chief questions which arise. The book ends with an interesting though not quite satisfactory attempt at a constructive statement which is intended to avoid all suggestion of the 'block universe,' which was the detestation of William James, and to emphasize the Divine Nature as life.

The history of belief in a future life has been further illuminated by Sir James Frazer's volumes on *The Belief in Immortality*. Dealing chiefly with religions of a very primitive character, Sir James brings fresh material to illustrate positions which he and others had already laid down. In particular, we may note the connexion of belief in a future life with the conception of a 'separable soul.' The most striking fact, however, which emerges from the investigation is the universality of belief in some kind of survival after death. This belief appears to be more widespread even than belief in some kind of god. 'Among savage races,' says Frazer, 'a life after death is not a matter of speculation and conjecture, of hope and fear; it is a practical certainty which the individual as little dreams of doubting as he doubts the reality of his own conscious existence. He assumes it without inquiry, and acts upon it without hesitation, as if it were one of the best-ascertained truths within the limits of human experience.' The natural mortality of man, the truth which text-books of logic so often dwell upon that 'all men are mortal,' is to the savage an unfamiliar idea. Scepticism about the future life is a product of civilization. Dr. B. Pratt in his valuable book *The Religious Consciousness* has pointed out the analogy of the child's mind with that of the savage in this respect. 'The child takes the continuity of life for granted. It is the fact of death that has to be taught. . . . Hence the explicit idea of a future life comes to him as the most natural thing in the world, provided that he is going to die at all.' In the same work we have a penetrating analysis of the psychological motives which lead to the persistence of the belief, an analysis based upon data derived from the collation of personal statements. It is interesting to observe that Dr. Pratt finds one of the most prevalent motives to be a perception of the difference between

the life of the self and the outer world; as Professor Pringle Pattison remarks, the essentially identical conviction of the primacy of the psyche lies behind all the Platonic 'proofs' of immortality.

The universality of belief in a future life leads us naturally to consider the value of the 'argument from consensus.' Only a very unimaginative person could fail to be impressed by the fact that the faith in some sort of survival of bodily death has been held by an overwhelming majority of the human race, including the lowest savages and the greatest intellects. The present writer has discussed the value of the consensus argument in an article in the *Church Quarterly Review*. In that article an attempt is made to draw a distinction between two kinds of consensus—consensus of reasoning and consensus of experience. Clearly the more primitive types of belief in the future life are closely connected with mistaken conceptions and false methods of thinking, and it would therefore be difficult to cite them as corroborating the beliefs of civilized man. It may be suggested, however, that the root of all belief in immortality is not reasoning, but an intuition of the nature of the self. If this could be shown there would be much weight in the consensus—for it would be a consensus of experience. Little stress appears to be laid, however, on this argument by recent writers, who give signs of being somewhat embarrassed by the wealth of material which the comparative study of religion has placed at their disposal.

The main battle rages round the primacy of the psyche, as it did in the days of Plato. The first step towards the establishment of the reasonableness of belief in personal immortality is to remove the objections arising from the alleged dependence of mind upon body. Facts which are open to every one's observation tend to confirm the opinion that apart from the organism there can be no mental or spiritual life, and these facts are reinforced by some results of science. Here the problem of immortality merges into the larger problem of the nature of Reality, and the controversy with Materialism and Naturalism. Professor Simpson, in his *Man and the Attainment of Immortality*, has given us a survey of the evolutionary view of the world's development, with special reference to the possibility of the transcendence of death. It is a remarkable sketch of a philosophy of evolution, as the advance towards spirit and a defence of the

position that immortality is attained, not possessed as an original endowment. The special question of the relation between mind and body cannot be discussed with any profit apart from the larger problems. Only one who had adopted Materialism or Naturalism on other grounds would be tempted to hold the view, which in itself seems frankly absurd, that thought is a mere 'epiphenomenon,' a shadow cast by the material world. A large number of studies of this problem of the place of mind in Nature have recently appeared in English. In essence there seem to be only three possible views, epiphenomenalism, parallelism, and interaction, though there are many modifications of each of these. Dr. McDougall's *Body and Mind* remains the most vigorous and well-informed defence of 'Animism'—a thoroughgoing, interactionist theory which maintains a 'substantial' soul. Dr. J. B. Pratt has devoted some sparkling lectures to the subject, published under the title *Matter and Spirit*, in which he exposes the absurdities of any view which denies the causal efficiency of mind. The present writer has also dealt with the subject as it bears on immortality in a little volume of lectures entitled the *Psychological Approach to Religion*. We must not omit a reference to Dr. C. D. Broad's large work, *Mind and its Place in Nature*. Dr. Broad would by no means be satisfied with the statement that there are only three possible opinions on the connexion between mind and body. On the contrary, he enumerates no less than seventeen. Dr. Broad's book is characterized by immense learning, and even greater subtlety. The plain man will often fail to see the point of his distinctions, and will find some difficulty in discovering what precisely Dr. Broad's own view is. On the whole, it would be true to say that the materialist theory has been losing ground. Parallelism is still the most favoured working hypothesis among psychologists, but they are becoming more fully awake to the fact that it is only a working hypothesis and not the final truth. Interesting developments are: (a) the attempt by 'emergent evolutionists' to combine all three theories as seems to be suggested by Lloyd Morgan in *Emergent Evolution*, and *Life, Mind, and Spirit*; and (b) the attempt on the part of idealist philosophers, as, e.g., Gentile (*Theory of Mind as Pure Act*) and Wildon Carr (*A Theory of Monads*), to get behind the problem and show that it arises from a misconception.

Since the time of Kant the chief argument for immortality has been based upon the moral consciousness. This may, however, take several forms. Bishop Butler, as is well known, though he relied to some extent upon the so-called 'simplicity' of the soul which has played so large a part in discussions since Plato suggested it, laid most stress upon the 'moral government of the universe,' which, he held, required a future life for its completion. This line of thought makes use of the conception of Divine justice, and can scarcely hold without the postulate that God is just in some sense not utterly different from our idea of justice. The modern idealist philosopher has usually found great difficulties in the thought of the justice of the Absolute. Justice, as Bosanquet remarks (*Principle of Individuality and Value*), belongs to the sphere of 'claims and counter-claims,' and can scarcely be extended to cover the relation of the individual to the Absolute. The argument has, however, found a vigorous defender in the late Dr. Rashdall, who has expounded it in the *Theory of Good and Evil*, and also in a remarkable lecture printed in 'King's College Lectures' on *Immortality*. Kant gave the argument a different form. The essence of the matter for him was the impossibility of the attainment of holiness, of the complete obedience of the will to the demands of the Categorical Imperative, within any finite period of time. Personal immortality was, therefore, a 'postulate' of the moral consciousness. Kant's formulation of the argument was coloured by his peculiar views on the nature of the practical reason. To him morality presented itself under the forms of duty and law. Idealism which has been influenced by Kant has on the whole preferred to adopt a different conception of the moral life and to think of it rather as the pursuit of the Good, the progressive realization of the true self in the temporal order. This was the theory made current in England by T. H. Green's *Prolegomena to Ethics*. Modern Idealism is not really breaking with Kant in this changed conception of the moral life, but rather developing another part of his doctrine—that of the 'noumenal' as distinguished from the 'phenomenal' self. The same argument which Kant used can be restated in terms of the self-realization ethics. No one has done this more persuasively than Josiah Royce, whose position may be indicated by one of his own pregnant sentences—'only an infinite process can show me who I am' (Royce, *Conception of Immortality*).

Idealism in the widest sense means any type of philosophy which holds that spiritual values are not mere by-products of a non-spiritual process, 'epiphenomena,' but integral to the structure of the universe. It is this kind of philosophy naturally which has taken seriously the problem of immortality. Thus the question has frequently been put in the form, Is the universe rational in the sense that it conserves the values which it produces, and, if so, does personal immortality follow as a logical consequence? The meaning of the rationality of the universe is open to discussion. In some sense every attempt to know reality starts with the faith that it is knowable and therefore rational. But the universe might be rational only in the lower sense of being intelligible to the understanding, while at the same time irrational in the sense that the reason could not approve of reality as having value. It is the contention of Bradley (*Appearance and Reality: Essays on Truth and Reality*) and of Bosanquet (*Value and Destiny of the Individual*) that the lower rationality cannot subsist apart from the higher, that we are compelled to assume the universe to be completely rational.

It might be thought that such an assumption would lead directly to the belief in personal immortality. This has not been the conclusion drawn by the majority of thinkers who make the assumption. Both Bradley and Bosanquet, together with many other representatives of the same school, would hold that values indeed are preserved in the Whole, but not finite persons. Bosanquet represents the world as a 'vale of soul making,' but not of soul preservation. It is frequently suggested by writers of this tendency that the desire for personal immortality belongs to a relatively inferior stage of spiritual life. Against this point of view stress has been laid on the intimate connexion of personality with value, and the difficulty of supposing that values developed in personal life can be preserved in an impersonal Absolute.

The 'metaphysical' arguments for immortality in the strict sense have not been prominent in recent thought. Dr. McTaggart, in his *Studies in Hegelian Cosmology and Some Dogmas of Religion*, is a firm defender of the view that immortality is philosophically demonstrable. Bergson in *Creative Evolution* suggests, in a somewhat enigmatic passage, that the *élan vital* is destined to overcome death. If this were worked out it would lead to a 'metaphysical' argument for a future life. More

interesting because more definite is the treatment of this question by the New Idealists of Italy. Gentile's whole system is based upon the distinction between the 'transcendental' and the 'empirical' ego, and the inherent indestructibility of the former. Thus immortality is self-evident, its opposite cannot be conceived, but it is the immortality not of the empirical but of the transcendental self. 'This personality through which we enter into the world of the manifold and of natural individuals, is rooted in a higher personality, in which alone it is real. . . . This personality is outside every "before and after." Its being is in the eternal, opposed to time, which it makes to be' (*Mind as Pure Act*, p. 147). It is worth while to notice that another line of philosophical thought which is prominent in England has nothing to say on the subject of immortality. The theories which may be grouped under the heading 'Emergent Evolution' are represented by Professor S. Alexander (*Space, Time, and Deity*) and Professor Lloyd Morgan. The latter is led to a belief in Theism, but does not appear to find any place for the survival of individuals.

The chief topic of speculation which remains to be considered is the nature of the future life. Dr. McTaggart's theory of the 'plurality of lives' has close affinities with Buddhism, but differs from it in holding the substantial self. It has not gained adherents, largely because of the obvious difficulty which arises about personal identity when there is no memory. 'The man in the past or in the future who knows nothing about me, whatever else he is, after all will not be myself.' These words of F. H. Bradley's sum up the gist of what most critics have felt about McTaggart's view.

Discussion on the Christian teaching concerning the future life has brought into prominence once more the doctrine of conditional immortality. In many ways the most remarkable and illuminating contribution has come from the late Baron F. von Hügel in his two essays on the *Apocalyptic Element in the Teaching of Jesus* and *What do we mean by Heaven, and What do we mean by Hell?* In the first he points out that there are two strands in the teaching of our Lord—the prophetic and the apocalyptic—and that these two elements are not easily reconciled with one another. Subsequent Christian doctrine has incorporated both traditions, with the result that Christian eschatological teaching has never been thoroughly consistent. The

scheme which has on the whole predominated—Heaven, Hell, Purgatory—has descended from the prophetic element, while the Millenarian expectation and the Last Judgment derive from apocalyptic sources. The latter series of beliefs is ‘more clearly rooted in Jesus’ actual eschatological utterances’ and is more in harmony with the doctrine of the resurrection of the body. In the second essay Baron von Hügel defends the conception of eternal punishment and hell. The essential point of his argument is that the alternative of Heaven or Hell is only presented to those souls who are ‘supernaturally awakened.’ Others, who form, we gather, a large proportion of the human race, are destined for Limbo, where they enjoy ‘natural felicity.’ ‘The lost spirits will persist, according to the degree of their permanent defection, in their claimfulness and envious self-isolation, in their niggardly pain at the sight or thought of the unmatched greatness and goodness of other souls. But now the disharmony of all this with their own past bitter experiences, and their own still present sense of the supernatural call, becomes more fully and more uninterruptedly conscious within them than it was wont to be on earth.’ This is an essay which should be carefully considered, though probably many readers will find themselves in violent disagreement. In particular the idea that there can be spirits ‘conscious of the supernatural call,’ yet totally unable to respond, raises great perplexities. Christian

thought appears to be moving in the direction of questioning whether the soul is naturally immortal, and several writers have pointed out that the N.T. as a whole is more in accordance with the view that ‘the gift of God is eternal life to them that believe.’ We may mention in particular Dr. Gore’s work, *The Holy Spirit and the Church*, which cautiously suggests a doctrine of conditional immortality, and Dr. A. H. McNeile’s useful though badly-arranged book, *The Problem of the Future Life*. The last-named work contains a good tabular statement of the cases for Eternal Punishment, Universalism, and Conditional Immortality.

It would be a hopeless task to review here the literature relating to psychical research. The mass of material is so great and its quality so various that it would require an article to itself. A general impression may be recorded—that the accumulating evidence, when sifted, is slowly making an impression on the minds of many who were inclined to be sceptical. Perhaps its greatest triumph is that it has affected one of the most critical minds in England—that of Dr. C. D. Broad, who, in his *Mind and its Place in Nature*, is constrained to admit on empirical evidence the probability of some survival of death. His scepticism has, however, not been so far overcome as to lead him to contemplate a personal survival. He prefers to speak of the persistence of a ‘psychic factor’; a conception which is to the mind at least of the present writer neither very inspiring nor very intelligible.

Literature.

SHARING IN CREATION.

THE Bohlen Lectures for 1925 were delivered by the Rev. W. Cosby Bell, D.D., Professor of the Philosophy of the Christian Religion in Virginia Theological Seminary. The somewhat vague title he chose for his book, *Sharing in Creation*, is explained in the sub-title as ‘Studies in the Christian View of the World’ (Allen & Unwin; 7s. 6d. net), so that the book challenges comparison with the important volume which brought the late Professor Orr into prominence. It is not written on the massive scale of Dr. Orr’s book, but within its own narrower limits it displays much competence. In

his power to make systematic theology not only intelligible to the plain man but interesting, Dr. Bell reminds us a little of the late Professor William Newton Clarke.

We were attracted to the book by the modest and sensible words in which it is introduced to us by the notice on the cover: ‘This book attempts to show that no problem of life is completely soluble, because life is incomplete and the world unfinished. We are in the midst of a great working out of things, and our Christianity is neither a static philosophy nor a dynamic life, but both.’ A theologian who makes no pretence to omniscience inspires confidence, and the sanity of the whole

discussion shows that that confidence has not been misplaced. Dr. Bell's criticism, for example, of the distinction commonly drawn between providence and grace is quite refreshing. He says: 'It is doubtful whether these discriminations serve any other purpose than to create confusion in our minds. . . . To establish two contrasted types of divine action is to attempt an analysis into which it is hard to put any clear meaning.' This will be good news to those who have long been puzzled by theological distinctions to which they could discover no corresponding reality.

This down-rightness characterizes the entire discussion—like the chapters on the Method of Creation, the Purpose of Creation, and the Providence of God. Creation is regarded as a continuing activity of God in the world, and man's task is to co-operate intelligently with Him, and by means of this co-operation, in which he is both dependent and independent, to develop increasingly that fullness of life for which he is destined. The spirit of the book is expressed in a phrase that occurs in a paragraph which the writer quotes from Professor N. S. Shaler on 'The Individual,' that behind the process of the universe 'a mighty Kinsman of man is at work.' It is a hopeful and heartening book Dr. Bell has given us, and laymen, to whom theology has hitherto been a terror, will here learn that she can wear a very friendly face.

WESLEY AS A PHILOSOPHER.

Dr. George Eayrs, who has already published half a dozen books on Wesley and Wesleyanism, has just issued a volume in which he presents the great man in a somewhat novel light: *John Wesley, Christian Philosopher and Church Founder* (Epworth Press; 7s. 6d. net). The book has as its main aim the thesis that Wesley was a great thinker as well as a great revivalist, and that his church policy and polity were a result of his constructive thinking. It does not seem probable that this thesis will find any wide acceptance. The language of the book in speaking of Wesley's purely intellectual and philosophical gifts is exaggerated. It is true that Wesley was a great personality. He is, it may be admitted, one of the really great creative personalities of religious history. He was also a great saint. He had statesmanlike vision, a strategic mind, and a mind of very considerable strength. These are big enough qualities, but Dr. Eayrs wants

more for him. This book makes large claims for his intellect on the purely philosophical side. We are told that he had the philosophical temper, that he read widely (including Plato, Augustine, Aquinas, Bacon, Grotius, and Malebranche, not to speak of John Smith, the Cambridge Platonist), and that his analysis of Christian experience was epoch-making. All this is true enough, and one interest of Dr. Eayrs' book is that he reveals so many facts of this nature. But they will not sustain the contention that Wesley was in any influential sense a philosophical magnitude. The book before us, however, is of very great value just because it emphasizes Wesley's intellectual interests and pursuits. The ordinary person thinks of Wesley as a revivalist *in excelsis* who appeared providentially just when England needed him, and who more by his piety and character than his intellect started a great movement which, in the hands of God, was used to great ends. It is a service of value to point out, and to prove, as Dr. Eayrs does, that Wesley was a big man, not only religiously and morally, but mentally as well. And if he is not accepted as having a place among the forces that have directed the philosophical stream, at least the greater forces, his greatness remains and will remain unaffected, and this book, by its research, its devotion, its competence, and its engrossing interest will still further enhance the admiration and love which are cherished for Wesley in all the churches.

ETHICS OF BUDDHISM.

All books on Buddhism deal more or less with ethics. Yet here is a competent authority who tells us that he knows only two that are devoted primarily to that subject. Accordingly, Professor S. Tachibana of Tokyo has published the treatise which won him his doctorate of philosophy at Oxford, though he has changed the title from the 'Ethics of Pāli Buddhism' to *The Ethics of Buddhism* (Milford; 15s. net), not without an uneasy feeling in his mind that the newer name is perhaps somewhat too large for the contents.

This is a full and discriminating study of one of the most beautiful products of human thought by one with every right to speak upon a theme that he has made his own.

There are two views on Buddhist (Pāli) ethics. To some the whole delicate structure, so exquisite in its hardy self-government, its heroic purity,

its abundant kindness and forgiveness, is a mere mirage, is after all only a subtler form of selfishness; since, so they say, the end even of its unselfishness is still self-seeking. The good is done, not for the sake of doing good, but to further one's own interests. Our author will have none of that, and, indeed, with the glorious and drastic precepts in one's hands it is a hard saying. Yet the fact is that for centuries multitudes of Buddhists, perhaps the majority of them, at least feel the sting of that criticism, and have evolved or stressed another and a higher motive.

Be that as it may, let any one study this book, and he can hardly fail to rise up from it, on the one hand ashamed of his own life grown very shabby in the fierce light of these brave ideals which this fellow-man of ours thought out, not always it may be as high and sane as those of the New Testament, and yet always how impressive; and, on the other hand, thankful that, if this is what life ought to be, we are not left to climb toward it alone, but can clutch at the steady hand of Christ.

THE ABBEY OF ST. GALL.

Dr. J. M. Clark, Lecturer in the University of Glasgow, is to be heartily congratulated on a learned and scholarly work, the fruits of extensive reading and diligent research, on *The Abbey of St. Gall* (Cambridge University Press; 18s. net). For several centuries the Abbey of St. Gall, founded about A.D. 613 by the disciple of the Celtic St. Columban bearing this name, was the chief seat of German literature, art, and music; and the theme of the volume before us is the contribution which it thus made to European civilization. This is the first systematic or comprehensive treatment of the theme, according to the author's claim. Moreover, it is 'a history, not a panegyric,' that the author seeks to present, and his aim is well reflected in the sobriety, exactness, and lucidity of his style. His judgments impress one as at once careful and competent. A special point he would make as against certain Irish writers is that after the middle of the eighth century the Irish or Celtic influence ceased to predominate in the Abbey founded in the valley of the Steinach. 'If the Irish sowed the seed, it was the Swabians who gathered in the harvest.'

In the chapter on 'St. Gall in Romance' the general reader will perhaps find most to interest

him. While the story of the Abbey furnishes Gottfried Keller and C. F. Meyer with motives, yet, curiously enough, it is in German and not Swiss writers that the story has played the most important part. In his 'Bilder aus der deutschen Vergangenheit' Gustav Freytag draws upon the *Gesta Caroli Magni* of Notker Balbulus, a scholar, poet, and musician, and one of the most illustrious of the monks of St. Gall; and in choosing St. Gall as a typical centre of Benedictine monachism he derives no small part of his material from the *Casus S. Galli* of Ekkehard iv., another famous monk of St. Gall, and a graphic chronicler. But it is in the pages of J. F. von Scheffel's signally popular romance of 'Ekkehard' that St. Gall and its monks received the most notable literary embodiment. The tragic love of Ekkehard and Hadwig is Scheffel's own invention, but in his description of life in Swabia in the tenth century the novelist makes, in general, faithful as well as effective use of the chronicle afore-mentioned.

But in Dr. Clark's pages all this is but incidental. His chief purpose, as already hinted, is to record the contribution of St. Gall to human progress in the spheres of literature, art, and music. It was in the first-named sphere that St. Gall made its outstanding contribution; nor should it be forgotten in this connexion that 'there is scarcely a single phase in the history of the theatre, from the first rudimentary beginnings of liturgical drama down to Ibsen, that has not been witnessed in St. Gall.' But St. Gall was also justly famous for its book illumination, and for its achievements in the sphere of music. Dr. Clark discusses these things with meticulous care, and he also provides interesting and informative chapters on the Plan of the Abbey, the School of St. Gall, and the Abbey Library and its Manuscripts. One of the most enduring services of the St. Gall monks to European culture was their transcription of classical and sacred manuscripts; and in the Abbey Library, as it is to-day, as our author remarks, the philologist and the palæographer, the historian and the liturgiologist all find an almost inexhaustible field for research.

RAMBLES IN VEDANTA.

Rambles in Vedanta, by R. R. Rajam Aiyar (Allen & Unwin; 12s. 6d. net), is a large book of well-nigh a thousand pages; and all kinds of

things are heaped together in its full and often eloquent pages.

Some of it, perhaps, may not be altogether up to date. For it is nearly thirty years since its young and eager author died. Yet all of it is interesting in a high degree, is indeed a window through which one can see far into the mind of modern educated religious India, or at least that section of it that has been touched by Western thought. We question if there is any book that lets one see farther or more clearly.

Rajam Aiyar was a student in the Madras Christian College. But, though he speaks with grave respect of 'the blessed Lord Jesus,' he was no Christian—thought indeed that 'India had grown too big for that coat.'

Devoted to philosophy and especially to poetry, both English and Tamil—his knowledge of modern English literature was wide—he found at last a permanent resting-place for his soul in the Vedanta, the ancient religious philosophy of his own country; and gave his few remaining years in a passion of enthusiasm to popularizing it in his 'Awakened India,' which till his death was the most widely read of Indian monthlies. He died at twenty-six.

The present work consists of a medley of his articles, very varied in their subjects and styles—masses of stories, some from the old classics, others original; vivid lives of the Indian saints; short challenging essays upon central themes like Bhakti, Avatar, Atman, the aim of the Vedanta, and the like—all written to the end that he may convince us that 'all tolerant all absorbing' Hinduism, or rather his own unusual conception of it, is the final religion. He believes that in some ways he is a better Christian than the Christians. But he has a horror of the crude materialism of our Western civilization, and what he feels to be the selfishness of our type of education and life. An arresting, informing, pathetic book.

In his work, *The Aim of Jesus Christ* (Allen & Unwin; 7s. 6d. net), Dr. W. Forbes Cooley, Instructor in Philosophy in Columbia University, offers a critical inquiry for the non-technical reader. He has been successful in gathering within the compass of his pages the chief results of recent New Testament scholarship, or at least the chief results of the 'modernist' interpretation. The

ethical aim of the book, beyond the critical and the historical, is not carried out so fully as the writer himself appears to have intended; on the other hand, the book contains more than the title indicates. Not only does it discuss the life and teaching of Jesus, as these are discoverable in 'the palimpsest of the New Testament,' treating of the prophetic ideal of the Kingdom of God as the central conception of the teaching; it also attempts to trace the steps whereby the gospel became a Hellenistic rather than a Jewish message, and the Church 'a brotherhood of hero-worshippers.' Of the Church the author says, and the remark may serve to throw light upon his standpoint, 'It would be the height of doctrinaire folly to scrap this deeply rooted and evolutionary product of the centuries in favour of some untried new and artificial device' (such as an Ethical Society). The work shows wide reading and reflective power and is marked by clearness of utterance, and it may be taken as a reasonable presentation of its subject from a 'modernist' standpoint. It is so packed full of references to New Testament passages that an index of such would have added to its usefulness.

One of the most acute and difficult problems in apologetics is the relation of mind and body. Professor Laird dealt with it recently in an excellent little book. Herr Paul Sünnner handles one aspect of the problem in another little book—*The Brain and the Mind* (Allen & Unwin; 3s. 6d. net). The treatment is historical and the commentary is acute and interesting. But the book does not make very much contribution to the solution of the problem. It does indeed show that the materialistic view is now almost wholly abandoned by educated minds, and that is itself a contribution of some value. But even though the positive suggestions may be few, the statement of the various views is helpful, and we can see with little trouble the situation as it is to-day. The book is well translated by Mr. C. Harry Brooks.

We have received several books from Mr. H. R. Allenson, and as we turn them over we are struck afresh by the clever use which this publisher makes of the paper wrapper. Not only are these wrappers attractive, but they are attractive in a quiet way which suggests that this is a book which is meant to be handled freely. And Mr. Allenson uses his cover also to give such an indication of what the book

contains that we are irresistibly drawn on from the reading of it to the reading of the book itself.

The three volumes before us are very different but are well worth reading. First there is *Vision and Strength*, a volume of essays selected and arranged by Sir James Marchant, LL.D. (5s. net). This is the third series of essays that have appeared in 'The Times' in the first instance, and then have been reprinted later in volume form. A number of newspapers now give space to articles dealing directly with ethical or religious topics, for it has become the fashion to-day to discuss these in the course of ordinary conversation as it certainly was not ten or fifteen years ago. But it was 'The Times' that led the way and that has given a column, week by week, to the religious essay. That was excellent, and it is excellent also that these essays are now preserved in more permanent form.

The second volume is by the late Rev. Thomas E. Miller, M.A.—known as the author of 'Portraits of Women of the Bible,' 'Portraits of Women of the New Testament,' and 'Portraits of Men of the Old Testament.' When Mr. Miller died a short time ago he left behind him the MS. of *Portraits of Men of the New Testament*, and the lectures have now been prepared for press by Mr. Robertson Christie, K.C. (5s. net). These simple and direct studies, full of evangelical feeling, must have been good to hear.

Must we tell a child about Death? Let us rather give her *Ever: A Child's Book of Joy*, by Miss Alice M. Pullen (2s. 6d. net). It is the story of Rosemary Anne, and of how she found out that all ends are really beginnings, and of how 'frocks aren't as important as Always, are they? and I've got their Always, haven't I?'

The career of St. Francis is always an engrossing theme, and many books have been written on the Poor Man of Assisi. We question, however, whether any more sympathetic account has been given of the saint's life than is to be found in the *Life of St. Francis of Assisi*, by the Rev. William H. Leatham, M.A. (James Clarke; 3s. 6d. net). It is a beautiful book, beautifully written. Something of the spirit of his hero has passed into the writer and touches his pen with what might be called eloquence, were that word not so suspect. The book is powerfully attractive not only by reason of its subject but because of the simplicity

and elevation of the writing. The main facts of the story are all here, but what grips the reader is the impression that this saintly and mediæval figure has a message for our own day. That is what Mr. Leatham set out to say, and he says it in a fashion worthy of his theme.

Books on world-peace are apt to be a little tiresome. Platitude abounds in their pages. But there are exceptions, and *Christianity and Universal Peace*, by the Rev. A. W. Harrison, M.C., B.Sc., D.D. (Epworth Press; 2s. 6d. net), is one. It is sane, level-headed, and (*mirabile dictu*) interesting. There are penetrating chapters on the teaching of the New Testament and on the development of Christian opinion about war. And in his closing chapter Dr. Harrison sums up the situation in wise and helpful words. His sensible conclusion seems to be that, just as slavery was abolished inevitably by the slow growth of Christian conviction, so war will be. That seems to be the last word on the subject.

The Art of Preaching, by the Rev. Harold Ford, LL.D., D.C.L. (Jenkins; 2s. 6d. net), has proved so popular that a fifth edition—revised and enlarged—has been required.

No book divides commentators more sharply than the Song of Songs. Students who believe in the historical approach to the Bible regard the mystical interpretation as a sheer irrelevance; yet it cannot be denied that the book, so interpreted, has fascinated some of the greatest saints and even preachers, like St. Bernard, of the Christian Church. Certainly, if the mystical interpretation of the book is ever in order, it could not be more persuasively presented than by S. L. Christian in *The Song of Mystery*, published at 6s. net by Messrs. Longmans, Green & Co., and commended in a Preface by the Rev. B. W. Randolph, M.A., Canon of Ely. Those who can concede the principle that there is adumbrated in the Song 'the sweet and holy mystery of His Love,' cannot fail to regard the exposition with gratitude; though it is rather an exposition, at once beautiful and searching, of the Christian's relation to his Lord, than an interpretation of the Song. But as it is written by one who well understands the life of devotion, it will be welcomed by those who desire to lead that life.

A well-informed book on the sources and history of the English Prayer Book has been written by the Rev. Dyson Hague, D.D., of Toronto, *The Story of the English Prayer Book* (Longmans; 5s. net). The story is told in detail, with much learning and even more enthusiasm. Those who love their Prayer Book will learn all about it from Dr. Hague, and will not love it the less under his guidance. The main contention of the book, apart from its rich store of mere historical lore, is that the Prayer Book is the product of an age, that of Reformation. It goes back to many roots, it contains contributions from many sources (and these are indicated here), but it is the embodiment of the Reformation spirit and faith. This is a contention that will be hotly disputed, but those who dispute it will have to reckon with the facts which Dr. Hague presents with great skill.

Every minister of the gospel, if he is to do his work well, must be accessible to the young men and women of his congregation, and must be ready to listen to their difficulties and to help them in them. The Rev. A. D. Belden, B.D., has just published a volume of essays with the title *The Religious Difficulties of Youth* (Sampson Low; 3s. 6d. net), which deals with the actual difficulties that have been brought to him. 'Not long ago the writer was asked by a young man, "Is it not enough to regard Jesus as a great human hero, practically the greatest?" The question is typical of a difficulty that confronts most thinking minds as they begin to investigate for themselves the main positions of their religion. The answer given in the present case was "Enter into real association with that hero and permit that association to lead you to whatever he has to offer."' This is how Mr. Belden deals with the difficulty about the supremacy of Jesus. He has chapters also on the difficulty of being spiritually-minded in a material environment, on religion and sex, on the question, Is Jesus an Impossible? and on a number of other difficulties on which light is sought from every minister. Mr. Belden states them frankly and evades nothing. There is a short introduction to the volume by the Rev. Sidney M. Berry, D.D. Mr. Belden, he says, has the courage which is needed in a difficult enterprise of this kind. 'For let there be no mistake about it, courage is needed. There are always those who are ready to plead that the elders should not be disturbed. The Church

which moves under that motto may earn the reward of placidity at the cost of forfeiting inspiration, for the Church which leaves one class undisturbed, will leave the other unmoved.'

In his work, *The Gospel of John* (Macmillan; 10s. net), Professor B. W. Robinson of Chicago Theological Seminary provides us with a brief, pointed, and untechnical handbook on the Fourth Gospel. It is designed for 'Christian leaders,' and it embodies the results of recent scholarly work on the Fourth Gospel and the early Christian history of which it is a part. Its aim is to show under successive chapter and verse headings how the newer knowledge accentuates 'the marvellously vital and far-reaching popular power of this Gospel.' The commentary proper is prefaced by general chapters on the authorship, characteristics, and popular quality of the Gospel. The author, in Professor Robinson's view, was a Greek-speaking Christian leader of Ephesus, who may not improbably be identified with the disciple whom Jesus 'loved'; as also with the presbyter John, mentioned by Papias and Eusebius. The work is generally characterized in the statement that it links up Christianity more closely with the career of its founder than any other religion has been so linked up, and sets forth the life of Jesus in terms of lasting significance. For example, the Son of God takes the place of the Messiah, and a present spiritual brotherhood of the Messianic Kingdom. Professor Robinson congratulates himself on having avoided the term 'hypostatization' in his exposition of the Prologue to the Gospel, but on the other hand he betrays in the course of his book a certain fondness for the term 'paratactic'!

There is a body of Christians which calls itself 'The Church of Christ,' and most people have the impression that it is one of the little 'fancy religions' which abound in this world of freedom. They are wrong. How wrong we are astonished to discover from a book which gives an account of the origin and tenets of the body: *What Churches of Christ Stand For*, by William Robinson, M.A., B.Sc., Principal of Overdale College (Publishing Committee: Churches of Christ; 6d. net). According to Mr. Robinson this body is distinguished by its broad-minded attitude to knowledge, criticism, and nearly everything else. It stands apart from creeds and, above all, it stands for the simplicity

of the original New Testament Christianity. The exposition in this little book is encouraging, but one asks with some surprise why the Churches of Christ stand outside the regular organized religious community.

The Religious Tract Society has just issued cheap editions of Dr. Edersheim's *The Temple* and *Sketches of Jewish Social Life in the Days of Christ*. The volumes are well printed and bound, and they are produced at 6s. net each.

The Student Christian Movement has done a real service to the cause of temperance reform by publishing *A Handbook to the Drink Problem*, by Mr. Will Reason, M.A. (1s. 6d. net), with a preface by Viscount Astor. Lord Astor has spent great pains on this preface of ten pages. He hits the nail on the head on every page. In form and

matter it is admirably written. The whole Handbook also is worthy both of the subject and of the preface. It is written in the form of question and answer. The questions are always pertinent, and the answers are always full and to the point. The book contains separate chapters on Local Option, Prohibition, the Carlisle experiment, very carefully examined; and finally suggests proposals for uniting temperance reformers. These include Local Option for England and Wales, Sunday Closing, applicable also to clubs in respect to the sale of intoxicants, and Magisterial Control of clubs. It is notorious that the number of bogus 'clubs' has greatly increased and is increasing. In fact, no sooner have the magistrates closed a public-house by buying out the licence-holder than it is converted into a 'club' and thus becomes a greater evil than before. More drastic legislation is needed to make this kind of evasion of the Law impossible.

The Parable of the Ten Virgins (Matt. xxv. 1-13).

BY THE REVEREND JAMES REID, M.A., EASTBOURNE.

Of all the parables, none has suffered more than this from the habit of misplaced emphasis. This story abounds in such picturesque symbolism, that many interpreters have been swept off their feet and out of their depth in the effort to follow their fancies. Like all the parables it is meant to drive home one point, and when that is caught the other details fall into their places. And the point which Christ is surely making is the demand which Christianity makes for a faith which is prepared to wait. He makes that clear in His final word, 'Watch, for ye know not the day nor the hour when the Son of Man cometh.'

The story gets its meaning from the marriage customs of the East. It was the bride's duty to wait, accompanied by her bridesmaids, till the bridegroom came to take his place in the marriage party. To welcome him, these maidens carried lamps to cheer the darkness, and without these none of them might take her place in the marriage procession. Five maidens, in the story, carried oil in their vessels with their lamps, a spare supply in case the bridegroom were delayed on his way. But

five were happy-go-lucky, taking the risk that everything would be all right. Thus equipped they took their places. The long hours wore on, and they all fell asleep. At last, in the darkest hour, the cry went up that the bridegroom was at hand. Meanwhile, the lamps of the five foolish ones had gone out; the short supply of oil was done. In a panic they begged of the others a share of their reserve, but that could not be; so they ran off to buy for themselves. 'And when they went to buy, the bridegroom came; and they that were ready went in with him to the marriage: and the door was shut.' That is the dramatic story. What does it mean? Surely this, that if we are going to be ready for the triumphant hour and opportunity of faith, we must have a faith that can hold out—a faith that is prepared to wait.

What Jesus means by the coming of the bridegroom is not very clear. That very ground is the debatable land of modern scholarship. The precise meaning of what is called 'the second coming' is hidden in mist, and perhaps Christ meant it so; for does not He come in various ways

to various people? But behind the various interpretations which are held there is one reality of which we can all be sure. To those who hold their faith through the darkness there comes an hour—it may be more than one—in which faith is vindicated, in which all the hopes it has held out are realized, and all the powers it has been nursing through the dark days find their great opportunity. And this also, that that hour brings its awful possibilities, both of triumph or of tragedy, according as we meet it. As for the form which this crisis will take, it is not possible to be dogmatic. A national situation has arisen before now in the course of history, or a world situation, in which men were called to decide 'or the right way or the wrong way to their triumph or undoing.' And in the storm and darkness those who had faith to see God's way went forward on the very waves of the storm to a new experience of God's fellowship and a new victory of faith and love. Or such a crisis has come, as in Wesley's day, after a long night in which for most people religion had been submerged, and those who had kept their lamps alight through the dark hours found the dawn of a new Christian era. Or such a crisis might come, as it has for multitudes, through the approach of death, and they have discovered there how 'the worst turns the best to the brave,' and beyond the threatening shadows lies the land of cloudless vision and final victory. Nothing is surer than that Christ saw ahead, for Himself and all His loyal followers, the final triumph of the forces of the Kingdom, in which all that disfigures the world as we know it shall be swept away, and Christian men will come to their own. 'Faith,' says Chesterton, 'is the perpetually defeated thing that defies all its conquerors,' but one day there is going to be no more defeat. The picture in which Christ describes that consummation has no cloud upon its joy except the shadow of those who miss it. Those who hope in Him will not be for ever condemned to wander in the valleys dreaming of the heights beyond. Those who stand for Him, and for His Kingdom, are one day to see of the travail of their soul. So much is clear—enough, surely, to cheer the heart. But it is equally clear, and this is His point, that if we are to be ready for this hour we must have the faith that is strong enough and alert enough to last out, and so to rise to the demand which this hour will make for spiritual quality. For all real advance takes us into a world, whether

here or beyond, which will make larger calls on the resources of the spirit. We must cultivate in the twilight the eye that can see. We must keep alive in us the moral sensitiveness that can answer the challenge. 'We shall see Him as He is,' says John. 'And he that hath this hope in Him purifieth himself even as he is pure.' They that were ready went in with him to the marriage.

It is this quality of faith, then, of which He bids us think, and for which He bids us test ourselves—the faith that is prepared to wait.

The point to fix our attention on is the contrast between these two groups of maidens. They both had lamps with oil in them. They both went out to meet the bridegroom. They were both, at their setting out at least, filled with the same eagerness, the same hope. They both, that is to say, had faith. Life at the moment was keyed up to the same great enterprise of faith. But the one group had no staying power. They made no preparation for the hours of darkness. They miscalculated the strain of the enterprise on which they had set out. They did not realize that faith's greatest quality is just this power to wait, this gift of holding on, this tireless loyalty, this iron patience. But the others had faced the possibilities. They knew that the bridegroom might be hindered on the road, and not arrive so soon as their optimistic hearts suggested. So they prepared to hold on, to stick it out, to see the darkness through, however dreary or disappointing might be their vigil. 'They took oil in their vessels with their lamps.'

Now it is just this quality of faith which, Christ would have us realize, the Christian way of life demands. There are plenty of people who have their great moments of faith. They have an experience in which belief in God, and in His mercy, burns up in a big blaze, or a mood when the conviction lays hold of them that the Christian way of life is the only possible road through the wilderness of this world. They see the glory of Christ clearly enough as it seems, and they set out. But when you meet them next on the journey their lamps are out. And you wonder what is the reason. The reason really is, when you get down to it, that their faith wore out; it just burned out; it had no staying power. They could not hold on through the long period of waiting. They found that things did not happen as they had expected; that somehow prayer was not the magical power which they had imagined; that the power of evil in their own

hearts, or in the world, was not cowed so quickly as they had hoped ; that the results of working for a better world and a more Christian kind of life, did not seem to weigh very heavy against the appalling mass of evil and selfishness. And they gave up. Faith just oozed away. The flame died down and then went out, and now there is only an empty lamp with perhaps a little smoke in it to tell you where the light had been. A traveller describes an iron standard which he saw in the Scilly Isles—a thing called a cresset. Once it held a fire which was lit and kept flaming to warn the passing ships away from the rocks, and guide them on their way. Now it has been superseded. The fire has gone out, and in its place there is a pot of flowers. The hearts of some people are like that—a burned-out fire where faith once flamed, and in its place the flower of a beautiful but ineffective memory. And the reason is, that they had not enough grit to keep it alive. They may tell you how it came to die. They may even describe to you the shock of sorrow or the like that killed it. But, in reality, that shock of which they speak only revealed, like the call to meet the bridegroom, the want of the flame that was not there. For their faith was already dead. It had possibly never been really alive. For the real faith—the faith which the Christian life demands—is the faith that has seen something in the face of Christ to which it is ready to be loyal through everything. It is not the faith which keeps burning in the hope that the worst will never happen : it is the faith which has already faced the worst in imagination, looked fairly and squarely at the darkness which it may have to meet, and made sure that in God it could survive.

That is what Jesus asks of us. It is the faith that can hold on through all the delays of His purpose, through all the disappointment and failure, through all that the darkness means. For that is the real strain which faith has to meet. It is the hour, perhaps, when we and others around us can see no sign of any movement of God. It may be that we have to live through a time of doubt or of the discredit of faith, such an hour, for instance, as that before Wesley came, when it was taken for granted by most intelligent people that Christianity was an outworn dream. Or the darkness may be of another kind. It may be that things are going well enough, that there is no big disaster or crisis at hand—such as the war, for instance, that drove

some people temporarily into the churches like tourists caught in a sudden thunder-storm. It may be that life is fairly comfortable, and people find it easy enough to keep up an average level of morality without the aid of religion, so they see no need of any great faith, and a faith like the Fatherhood of God appears to them as futile as a lighted lamp in the sunshine. It is that kind of hour that really tests faith. Or the darkness may take another form. The question which people are asking to-day about Christianity is not whether it is credible, but whether it is practicable. We are living in an age when the idealisms that spring from the authority of Jesus are met by the objection that, however beautiful they may be, they cannot be made to work, that our modern machinery cannot be coupled to the moral energy of the spirit of Jesus, nor our methods squared with His principles. And those who hold the faith that He is Lord and that love as He defined it must have its way in any healthy social order, are merely crying for the moon. But that and nothing less is our faith. Can we hold on ? Can we go on living it out day by day, seeing life, with its trifling calls and duties, in the light of God's mighty purpose ? Can we go on holding our faith when we can see no very striking opportunity to put it into practice on a big scale ; while we wait for some open door, some bridegroom call to go forth to meet Him in a great forward move ? We can all get our blood up when faith is challenged, when some big moral issue is up for settlement, and we can see a chance of doing something big. We feel we could rise to a great occasion, but the test is whether we can be loyal when there is no occasion for doing anything very striking except being loyal to the big convictions that will one day come to their own. Tertullian has a well-known saying that 'faith is patience with the lamp lit.' In other words, faith in its ordinary demand upon us is just this kind of patience that keeps loyalty and love glowing in our hearts amid the long delays of God. 'The wise took oil in their vessels with their lamps.'

Now, of course, Christ would not have us imagine that faith is useless in the little occasions, and the humdrum ways of life or business ; that it is only a reserve we keep for the big emergencies. It has its value for the common day, for the hours when we seem to be doing little more than marking time. It is the one thing which gives the daily round and the common task their real meaning and value.

It brings a glory into the commonplace. Our daily contacts with our fellows are filled with a new spirit when we meet them with the faith that God is Father, and we are all His children. 'The Christian life,' says some one, 'is infinite love in ordinary relationships.' There a sweetness and calm which faith can give that makes a smile a sacrament. His biographer says of Canon Barnett, who kept his lamp burning for years in the slums of London, that the spirit of his church was that of a man 'who founded temporary helpfulness on deathless principles.' Faith does not demand of us that we should be ever on the strain. That would bring into life a restlessness that is foreign to the spirit of the New Testament. Those wise virgins were calm and confident, free from care, so confident and free from care that, like the foolish ones, they could fall asleep. But their calm, unlike that of the others, was the real thing. It was not based on a thoughtless optimism which shuts out the possibilities of disaster, but on the knowledge that whatever strain may come, they had that which made them ready to meet it. Victor Hugo has a picture of a bird perched on the precarious branch of a tree that seems as if it might break under its weight any moment, or be swept from under it by any gust of wind. And yet the bird *sings—because it knows that it has wings*. That is the power of faith, to beget in us a confidence, a calm, a security through everything, which can give us the freedom to be gay, and to find the good in every passing moment. The people who have real faith are in the position to get the best, and see the best, in life's common toil and struggle, because at every moment they are open to God, and know that He meets them there.

They carry music in their hearts
Through dusty street and wrangling mart,
Plying their daily tasks with busier feet
Because their secret souls a holy strain repeat.

This real faith which is drawing deeply of the resources of great convictions, and standing for them through everything, has its hourly victories. But some day, says Jesus, it will have its great task, its great challenge, its abundant triumph. 'They that were ready went in with him to the marriage.'

Now these days we live in are days of waiting. Those who are alive to the need of the time are longing for a great step forward. 'When will the next revival come?' is a question which men are asking. The more we think with a Christian mind

about the world we live in, the more we find ourselves immersed in conditions which are not Christian, from which we can neither escape, nor escape responsibility, and in which, with all our will, there seems very little that we can do. We realize that God must take the initiative, that every new stage is by an awaking, a visitation which is nothing less than a coming of Christ. The day is at hand when somehow things will conspire to create a situation in which those who can read the signs of the times will realize that He is calling us all to a new stage, a new victory of His Spirit in the earth. And the question is whether when that call comes we shall have the faith, the vision, the spiritual quality that are equal to it. Shall we have oil in our vessels with our lamps?

How can we make sure? There are two ways at least. We can steadily learn the mind of Christ. It will not do to say, as some do, that a very little knowledge is enough for us; or, as others do, to pour scorn on those who week by week are seeking to learn more truth than they ever use. Browning's Grammarian, grinding at grammar, is a standing rebuke to those who, in their knowledge of spiritual things, are living from hand to mouth, and thinking only of the present.

Earn the means first. God surely will contrive
Use for our earning.

If the Church is to be ready for God's call she must give herself to learn of Christ, to know His mind. The lamp of faith can never keep burning on any lesser inspiration. Nothing else than this closer, deeper, and ever deepening contact with His mind and spirit can kindle a light in the heart that will be strong enough to last out, and pierce the darkness, so as to recognize Him when He comes.

And the second thing that keeps faith burning is the gathered experiences and deepened convictions that come through the faithfulness of every day. Ordinary Christian living does this for us; it creates within the mind a Christian tradition, a store of experience on which we can draw in a dark hour. As Paul puts it, we become 'rooted and built up in Him.'

There is such a thing as a habit of faith, a Christian habit of facing life. It is this habit of action in the line of our faith which keeps the lamp burning. And this light, which grows strong in daily faithfulness, will show us the way when the hour strikes in which we are called to choose between some great

high road to a better world and the lower road of surrender to passion or selfishness that leads back to the jungle. To take an instance, the day is coming when we shall have to choose in a definite situation between the way of war and the way of peace. And on this point Miss Fry says: 'We shall never get our warless world, our world of peace and brotherhood, through external schemes of security, through the propagation of peace in the abstract. Nothing will hold when a cyclone of war-feeling sweeps over a country but a deep-seated habit of goodwill cultivated and formed in the hearts and lives of men.'

There is an insight that grows finer as we seek to see God in ordinary situations, and so lays us open to His deeper calls. The other day a man, who had suddenly been faced with the fact that death might not be far away, was telling me of the deep, rich peace which had flooded his soul, and

delivered him from panic and bitterness. 'But,' said he, 'I know I could never have taken it like this, and found God in it, if I had not been trying to see Him, and be faithful to Him, through all these quiet years.' Only the eyes that have grown strong by loyalty to insight in ordinary life are keen enough to pierce the midnight darkness. Only the faith that meets the daily strain with patience is ready for the big emergency, the sudden call which, however it come, is for the loyal the open door to a triumph and discovery, in which all their loyalty will be rewarded.

Wanted volunteers
To do their best for two-score years!
A ready soldier, here I stand,
Primed for Thy command,
With burnished sword.
If this be faith, O Lord
Help Thou mine unbelief.

Changes in Religious Thought during the Last Fifty Years.

BY THE REVEREND FREDERICK J. RAE, M.A., DIRECTOR OF RELIGIOUS EDUCATION,
TRAINING CENTRE, ABERDEEN.

ONE of the compensations of growing older is the wider compass of one's experience. You see the world changing; you see one age passing into another, one generation and one way of thinking peculiar to that generation going and another coming. If you are an optimist, that is to say, if you believe in God, this is an exhilarating spectacle. You have the chorus to the drama in your faith, and, though it is not necessary to accept everything that happens as part of the plan of God, yet you can see Him behind everything, and because you are sure that God is in His own world you can look on without being overmuch disturbed by *anything* that happens.

There is always change. But I think one may say that in the last fifty years things have changed so much that we are really living in a new religious world. Beliefs, habits, atmosphere are very different. The whole of the religious world of fifty years ago so far as it was dogmatic seems to have faded away. The standpoint is different, and all that follows a standpoint is different. We

may think that the older attitude, and the older beliefs, were truer and better than those of to-day. It is not necessary to view the theology of the present time as final or even as better than the former. But at any rate it is in command of the situation. It is the product of intellectual currents of influence that have been at work during a generation. It is the present generation's discovery of truth and way of life, and it seems to me that we who have seen something of what has happened might sometimes stop and survey the scene and tell others what has passed before our eyes. If it is true that a revolution has been silently going on in men's religious outlook, it may not be without some benefit to try to ascertain what it amounts to, what changes have occurred and with what results for belief. It is a modest report of this kind that I desire to make in this paper.

CREATIVE FORCES.

Perhaps the best way to make this report will be to name the forces that have been at work

on men's beliefs and trace something of their influence.

I. The first of these is *Science*. Some of us are old enough to remember the tremendous impact which the scientific discoveries of the nineteenth century made on religious belief. Darwin, Huxley, and Tyndall were at the height of their influence. Science was confident and even somewhat arrogant. The religious world was timid and fearful. Darwin seemed almost to have pushed God out of the universe, and materialism was rampant and aggressive. It was a difficult time. I remember in my boyhood that the secularists, as they called themselves, held large meetings and sold blatantly atheistical literature openly in their shops. All that has passed away; so completely that the youth of to-day does not realize how hard a young man had to fight for his faith then. But it has passed away before a wave of spiritual influence which has been gaining strength slowly and surely, fed from many sources and creating an atmosphere which to-day is entirely favourable to faith. Materialism has hardly any supporters to-day. Philosophy, even in its most realistic schools, is on the side of the angels. It is very much easier to believe in God to-day than it was fifty years ago. So much for the atmosphere.

It is, however, only now that we are beginning to realize the full effect of the scientific movement on religious belief. One of the results of the doctrine of evolution which created dismay earlier has been permanent in its effect, and, though it concerns only a detail, that has proved to be of far-reaching importance. The account which science gives of the making of the world is far different from that given in the first chapter of Genesis. It is impossible to reconcile them. And if we say it is not necessary, that opinion is a measure of the change that has taken place in our view of the Bible. It is not necessary because Genesis gives us a religious account of creation, not a scientific. But if so, what *is* the account in Genesis? Obviously it contains the science of a primitive age, with its solid vault of Heaven, its flat earth, its waters above the vault, its windows in the firmament. In short, it is a legend. And when we admit the presence of legend in the Bible the whole view which governed the believing world fifty years ago is altered. For it is obvious that, in that case, there are errors in the Bible. And to-day we have to place its authority, whatever that is, on a basis

which allows for error, at least scientific error, to go no further at present.

But the effect of the scientific movement, and especially its evolutionary theory, has had a much wider influence. It has profoundly affected our thought of God. I was brought up on the doctrine of transcendence in its starkest form, and I fancy it was the prevailing conception of God in the religious world. The Creator of the world reigned and governed from a sphere called Heaven which was above somewhere and, at any rate, was outside the world. From time to time He intervened, especially when anything went wrong, but He acted on the world from without. This was entirely in accord with the Calvinistic conception of the Sovereignty of God and of His supreme Will dictating and determining what would happen in accordance with eternal decrees. But the conception of an evolving world gradually and almost insensibly modified this conception. To-day, largely, I think, as a result of the evolutionary theory, with support from the idealistic trend of philosophy, and partly in reaction from a too hard conception of God, we have returned to the thought of an immanent God. God is *in* the world, working from within, behind the urge that has sent the world on and up, ever upwards, stage by stage; God is in the green of the grass, in the beauty of flower and sky and sea, the life force that expresses itself in natural selection and growth and progress. Behind history, also, a purpose realizing itself through the rise and fall of nations, through wars and diplomacies, using the policies of statesmen and the ambitions of peoples to work out a grand design. Behind the life of men and women too, *in* them, the strength of their endeavours, the light of their seeing, the joy of their conquests, the inspiration of all discovery and enterprise, the truth of all religions, the explanation of all good, the Light that lighteth every man coming into the world. The Indwelling God. No one has given such perfect expression to this as Wordsworth:

I have felt
A presence that disturbs me with the joy
Of elevated thoughts; a sense sublime
Of something far more deeply interfused,
Whose dwelling is the light of setting suns,
And the round ocean, and the living air,
And the blue sky, and in the mind of man:
A motion and a spirit, that impels
All thinking things, all objects of all thought,
And rolls through all things.

This is the conception of God which commands the mind of our generation. Some time ago I read a volume with the title *The Need of a New Idea of God*, in which the writer expounded the doctrine of immanence as a fresh discovery of this age. That is, of course, absurd. It is not a discovery. The truth is written all over Scripture. It is everywhere in the Psalms. Think, for example, of Ps 139. Where could you find a more profound description of the indwelling God? Jesus' teaching is full of it. 'The very hairs of your head are all numbered.' 'If God so clothe the grass . . . not a sparrow falleth without him. . . .' And Paul, 'For of him, and through him, and to him are all things.' It is not a discovery, but it is a rediscovery. We have all noticed how the pendulum swings in the history of human thought, and how one age swings up to the limit of a half-truth and holds by it as if it were all, until the next age swings up to the other limit and holds by that as if it were all. To-day we are emphasizing the immanence. And what I am concerned with at present is simply the effect of this on our religious thinking generally. It is responsible for a rather widespread recrudescence of Pantheism, or at least pantheistic ways of thinking. One evidence of the prevalent tendency may be seen in Mr. H. G. Wells's picture of a striving God, a God under the yoke with us, working for a better world, a sort of God in the making, just the apotheosis and personification of the evolutionary urge. But there is one effect of this emphasis on immanence which comes much nearer to us. It has brought about a new way of thinking about the Incarnation. The Catholic doctrine of the Person of Christ was that He had two natures in one Person and that He was an altogether new and unique phenomenon, an absolutely fresh beginning in history and in human life, with neither commencement nor end of days. But when we think of God as present everywhere and always and working out *all* good from *within*, this has an inevitable effect on our conception of His revelation of Himself. We can trace His presence, for one thing, in all good men. We can recognize Him in the saints and heroes of humanity, as the Divine Spirit who is at the heart of all things and is the Light that lighteth every man, not in the saints of Christianity only, but in those of all religions and no religion. We can trace the upward trend as it embodies itself in these great lives. It is incarnate in them. They are imperfect incarnations of

God's purpose and goodwill. And they were preparing the way for Jesus, who incarnates perfectly what others did imperfectly. This is the way in which the educated mind of our time is reflecting on the Incarnation. I do not think we ought lightly to pronounce it heresy. I confess that it helps my faith. The doctrine of the two natures in one Person is a difficult thing to grasp intelligently. It is an effort to think together two impressions which we receive from the historical Christ. When we read the Gospels, what we find is a Person who is wholly human and wholly Divine, not one part of Him human and another part Divine. If we think of God as the Eternal Spirit working all good in the world from within and expressing Himself completely in this human life, we can say of Christ that He is very God of very God, as well as very man of very man. He is the perfect Incarnation of the Divine Being and the perfect flower of the human spirit. The mind of our generation stops there and professes itself unable to construe any further the relation of the Divine and the human in Christ. I admit the vagueness of the modern formula. Its weakness is that it may embrace those who regard Jesus as nothing more than the highest reach of humanity, as well as those who emphasize the fulness of His Divine being. My business, however, is with exposition rather than judgment.

One other effect of the emphasis on immanence I may refer to before passing on: its influence on our attitude to the miraculous. Here, I think, we may have real assistance. The older conception of miracle was that it was a breach in the iron system of law, made by the intervention of the God from the car. He broke into this closed system for some purpose. This was a difficult idea when the world was regarded as a mechanical regularity. It is perhaps not so difficult since the earlier scientific insistence on a universal Reign of Law has been modified. We can hardly call the Reign of Law a scientific dogma any longer. But in any case miracle is a different thing when it is regarded as the action or activity of a Purpose and a Power always present and always at work in Nature and history and life from within. What is called miracle is no breach of uniformity. It is the plus of the Divine worker. It is an extra in the normal expression of His activity. It is the bursting into flower of His purpose for special ends. It is easier from the standpoint of immanence to justify and

to rejoice in the great deeds of God in Israel, in Jesus Christ, in the Church, and in the life of man. Miracle is just the emphasis God lays on certain ends. The Power that produces the stars and the grass and man and holds everything in being is, it is natural to think, able to express itself in great acts and in abnormal inspirations.

2. I must now pass to the second of the creative forces which have been working in these fifty years—*Criticism*. I do not need to trace the course of its labours. You know its history as well as I do. Nor do I need to justify its use. The Bible is a literature and must be estimated as other literature is. But perhaps I may try to sum up what its results have been for our view of the Bible. I speak only of assured results, and I confess that there are ‘results’ presented by critics which are far from assured. It is these crudities of criticism which have alarmed good people and made many of them Fundamentalists. In the latest issue of the *Modern Churchman*, for example, we find a paper by a writer who calmly assures us that the seven words from the Cross were not spoken by Jesus but represent what His followers thought of Him. This kind of thing will be regarded as offensive—even stupid—by many who are in entire sympathy with criticism. But there are aberrations and stupidities in every school. In spite of them we must heartily accept what historical and literary criticism has achieved. So far as the Old Testament is concerned its work is done. And its results may be summed up under three heads: (1) It has placed the books in their historical environment, and has thus enabled us to read the history of Israel as a great panorama of Divine Providence and Grace. It has shown us that the fundamental element in the Old Testament was the evangelical, not the legal. Law was the petrification of Old Testament religion. Behind the law is prophecy, and in its broadest sense prophecy was the soul of Old Testament religion. It was only when religion became legal that the evangelical prophet disappeared. And so we are able to see clearly that grace is the meaning of the whole revelation of God in both dispensations. That is the broad effect of the critical movement so far as the Old Testament is concerned. (2) Another result is that we have learned that the method of all ancient historical compositions, that of compilation, was that employed by Old Testament writers. They simply copied in

their authorities. And so we find parallel narratives of the same event belonging to very different periods. Any one can see this in the narrative of the Flood, for example, or in the two accounts of creation in Gn 1 and 2. But the same method is plainly illustrated in books like Samuel. Now there is in this conclusion of criticism some help and at the same time something revolutionary. It is a help because it enables us to explain manifest contradictions in the narrative. One story, for example, tells how David slew Goliath (1 S 17), but another tells that he was slain by Elhanan (2 S 21¹⁹). Our translators were naturally scandalized by this contradiction, and inserted in italics ‘the brother of’ before ‘Goliath’ in the second narrative, which of course is not in the Hebrew text. That is one of many examples, and it (as well as the rest) is simply explained when we know that these are different strands of narrative preserving different traditions and belonging to different ages. But this fact has a more far-reaching effect on our view of the Bible. It is clear that many of these narratives belong to times long after the events which they chronicle, in some cases hundreds of years. It is certain, then, that the story of remarkable deeds would be repeated with amplifications, and that the marvellous in them would be heightened in the telling and retelling. In particular the interpretation of events would by and by be embodied in the narrative of the events themselves and become part of the story. Now this greatly relieves the strain which Old Testament miracles place on our belief. We can see, for example, how the wonderful things Elisha did would be amplified as they were told and retold in the Schools of the Prophets. And we find in this a real religious liberation when, for example, we read the story of the death of Uzzah. We accept the event, but we allow ourselves to refuse the interpretation. We cannot believe God struck him dead for touching the ark. The narrator could not *know* that it was God who did it. That was his interpretation. The same thing applies to events like the bears devouring children for shouting a disrespectful word to the Prophet. The tragedy may have happened to the children, but we refuse the interpretation. In this way Old Testament criticism has been an aid to faith. At any rate its analysis of documents must be accepted as final, if the broad results are regarded. Individual critics may and do exaggerate. The claim to be able to divide

a document between seven different writers assigning each his share seems to me to argue the lack of a sense of humour. Nevertheless the fact that, as in a rope there are strands which can be separated, so in the Old Testament there are different and easily recognizable narratives which can be separated and which have been woven into a whole, is one which, I think, is beyond dispute. (3) A third result of the criticism of the Old Testament is to show us that Revelation is a growth. The older view was that it was all on one level, and that texts might be quoted indiscriminately to prove any Christian doctrine. That was the view of Scripture taught in our colleges thirty or forty years ago. It is the view held by the ordinary Bible reader to-day. But it is one of the most certain conclusions of criticism that this is wrong. As criticism has placed the books it has enabled us to see how at every point revelation brought an ever clearer knowledge to Israel, first, of what God is, and, second, of what man should be. We can see the growth of law. We can trace different codes, each suitable to a different stage of the nation's progress. We can see men discarding primitive notions of God and reaching out to higher and purer ideas. We can see Israel discarding primitive notions of conduct and adopting higher standards (compare, for example, Samuel's hewing Agag in pieces before the Lord, or Jehovah ordering the extermination of the inhabitants of Jericho, men, women, and children, with the picture of Is 53 hundreds of years later, where the servant of God bears the iniquities of others). We can see the knowledge of God growing from the early anthropomorphism of primitive tradition to the monotheism of the great prophets, and even in them each succeeding prophet bringing monotheism a stage farther till Jeremiah and Ezekiel proclaim God's interest in individuals and the world is ready for Christ's supreme disclosure. This truth of the Progressiveness of Revelation is the key to the understanding of Scripture. It is one of the supreme services of criticism that it has made it possible for us to recognize this truth and has given us a clear proof of it.

Criticism of the New Testament is not by any means at its concluding stage. But its results as generally accepted are reassuring rather than disturbing. It has not to do with narratives that are hundreds of years apart from the events. That is where the evidence for miracles in the New Testa-

ment is so different from the evidence for those in the Old. The narratives of miracle were composed in the lifetime of those who witnessed the events. And the analysis of the Gospels takes us back very near to the events they narrate. It is true that we are still at the irresponsible stage here and that some of those who write as Broad-Churchmen in England can play with the great events of the gospel as though they were counters, meaning little. The Resurrection, the Parousia, and the Apocalyptic vision of Jesus are all spoken of as though they were later accretions to the gospel story. There is, I am convinced, no critical reason for such an opinion. I think it may be said that, broadly, New Testament criticism has tended more and more to confirm the main essential facts of the gospel narratives.

What, then, is the result of this critical movement of the last fifty years for the Bible as a whole? We have seen that we must admit the presence of legend in the Old Testament traditions; that the narratives of miracle are often hundreds of years after the event; that the interpretation of an incident which our Christ-taught conscience at once rejects is frequently incorporated in the story of the incident itself; that what we read in the Old Testament is a progressive revelation of Himself by God, of His nature and His will, starting from primitive ideas and leading on to the consummation in Christ. It is obvious that these facts make any belief in a literal verbal inspiration of Scripture an impossibility. The whole attitude to the Bible of fifty years ago has for educated minds passed away. You cannot quote a verse in the first chapter of Genesis to prove the doctrine of the Holy Trinity. Nor can you feel any necessity to defend primitive morality in Judges. Nor can you find it necessary to defend the command of Jehovah to exterminate the Canaanites. These things are all easily explained if you view the Bible as the record of a progressive revelation.

Does this mean that the infallible authority of the Bible has gone? No. It means that our whole view of what the Bible is has been changed. If you demand a Bible without error or defect, historical or scientific, it can be said that such a Bible does not exist. But if you ask: What was the Bible given to bring us? you find an answer which leaves untouched its full authority. It was given to bring us a knowledge of God, and that is what it does bring us. If I were to look at my watch

to find the day of the week or the temperature of the room in which I am writing you would regard my conduct as insufficiently intelligent. It was made to tell the time and for no other purpose. Why, then, look in the Bible for what it was not given to provide? It was not *meant* to give either exact history or exact science. It was meant to give us a knowledge of God for our salvation. And that is what it does give, infallibly and without fail. This is its authority. This is what separates it from all other literature. And if we regard it from this point of view, how impressive are its promises, and how profound its insight into the needs and desires of man! You can see how from this standpoint the psalms and the prophets stand out as divinely inspired, inspired because the writers were enabled to interpret God to us, which is what their inspiration meant. And so, while the older view has passed away, criticism has helped us to a better and truer view which not only embraces all the facts and accepts them, but shows us an infallibility of Scripture which no new knowledge of any kind can disturb.

Before I pass from this there is one point to which a brief reference must be made. The older view of Scripture still dominates much of our preaching. So that while preachers have given up believing in it they still treat the Bible in expounding it as though the older theory were true. There is no dishonesty in this. It is simply the persistence of a tradition. But I think it is time that this tradition should cease, because we unconsciously and unintentionally give the pew the impression that the old view still holds the field. And it is an urgent necessity to-day that the pew should be informed of the truth. There is too wide a gap between the knowledge of the clergy and the ignorance of the laity. There is a great danger here. Many of the educated laity are perplexed. They know that things are not what they were. They have a vague idea that the authority of the Bible has been compromised. They are uneasy, but they do not *know*; and one result of this is the impossibility of anything like a revival of religion while men's minds are in doubt about the basis of faith. The older revivals came when the people were sure. They trusted an infallible Bible, and the Word of God could be appealed to. To-day the man in the street knows that things have changed. But he does not know how or with what result. The man in the pew knows little more, and I am convinced

that no revival of religious life on a large scale will or can come until the confidence of the plain man in the basis of faith is restored. And therefore I urge strongly that the duty of the pulpit is to share its new knowledge with the pew. There is an urgent need for frank and fearless, if cautious and balanced, instruction on the nature and extent of the authority of Scripture. When the plain man is sure of his ground he will go forward in the service of the Kingdom, but not till then.

3. Now I have only one other of the creative forces which have been operating in the last fifty years to deal with. It is what may be called the discovery of the central and all-controlling place Christ holds in the whole Christian revelation. This, so far as the last fifty years are concerned, was a new thing. In the theology in which I was brought up, a theology which dominated all Scottish religion and was behind all the worship and service of the churches, Christ was indeed a prominent and essential figure, but it was as the chief actor in a religious drama. The theology was the 'covenant' theology and it was largely inspired by the Old Testament. It was a curious amalgam of Old Testament conceptions and New Testament facts. God, the Author of salvation, was the God of the Old Testament. The main governing fact about Him was His predestinating purpose and decree which included and embraced a certain proportion of humanity, the saved. These were redeemed by the substitution for them on the Cross of God's Son who bore the punishment they deserved and thus exhausted it. The way of salvation was by the acceptance of this scheme. It was the only way. There was only one door into the Kingdom, and this was the narrow door. Those who did not accept it were condemned to everlasting punishment. The universe was a very simple and well-defined affair, Heaven, Earth, and Hell, and earth was simply a temporary home of men on their way to one or other of their permanent abodes. In this theology the Old Testament and St. Paul were perhaps equally dominant. The Gospels were largely ignored, and especially the teaching of Jesus. His words (such as those about the narrow and broad ways) were twisted to read like admonitions of the covenant doctrine.

Now I do not think I exaggerate when I say that this whole system has been swept away. Its very terms are unfamiliar to the ears of this generation. Its main beliefs are extinct. And this has

been done, not by criticism, but by the discovery of Jesus. The Christian thinking of our day is Christo-centric, to use a horrible modern phrase. And what this emphasis on Jesus has done has been first of all to give us a fresh disclosure of God. The God of the elect, of predestination as it was interpreted by Calvinism, of the Covenants, was plainly seen not to be the Father whom Jesus revealed. No doubt the Fatherhood was, as is the way of reactions, taken too exclusively as a conception exhaustive of the nature of God. And for many He became very much 'le bon Dieu' of French conversation, a good-natured Person who would not be hard on anybody. But that is probably passing. And in any case the 'back to Jesus' movement has permanently dislodged the God of Calvinistic theology. But further, the emphasis on Jesus has completely destroyed the fear of Hell. Men simply do not believe in an eternity of torture. So far as real thinkers are concerned the doctrine of conditional immortality seems to be having a wide acceptance. If all men are not to be saved, then the lost will simply perish because they have not in themselves the life that alone is eternal. The point of importance, however, is that an everlasting abode of woe is not credited. Rightly or wrongly, except in very orthodox circles, it has ceased to be treated as a possibility.

But there is a third result of the emphasis on Jesus, even more revolutionary. It is only in a certain limited circle that the acceptance of Christ as sin-bearer and substitute is regarded as the one way into the Kingdom. That there are many doors into the Kingdom is an accepted truth. To have any hold of Jesus Christ is to be saved, to hold only the hem of His garment like the man in Browning's 'Christmas Eve.' This means that the 'Plan of Salvation,' as previously conceived, can hardly be regarded as God's only way of winning men. A further result of the emphasis on Jesus is the new perception that Christianity has a social message. I fancy few would now deny that the message of the Gospels has at any rate social implications, and that if Jesus is to be Lord He must dominate *all* life and not the

life of the spirit only. This is so obvious that I leave it there.

A final example of the way in which the emphasis on Jesus has altered Christian thinking is its effect on the interpretation of Pauline teaching. Modern books on St. Paul read him in the light of Jesus and regard him as not the initiator of Christianity (as critics like Pfleiderer did) but as the real interpreter of Jesus. And instead of setting Paul in opposition to Jesus they regard him as His best exponent. At one time the slogan of New Testament critics was 'back to Jesus from Paul'; to-day it is 'back to Jesus *with* Paul.' It is Paul's experience of the love of God in Christ that is regarded as the key to all his theology. And to-day the best Christian thinking takes the whole New Testament as containing one great message of which the centre and the source and the end is Jesus Christ. That is the final achievement of the new emphasis on Jesus, and in some ways its greatest and best.

After this review of the changes in religious belief and thought during the last fifty years, one naturally asks: Have they altered anything essential? There have been great changes in religious *habits* of which I have said nothing, in Sabbath observance, in Church activities and in other ways. But the question that matters is this: Do we have the same gospel? Can we accept what science teaches, what criticism has done, what the new orientation of New Testament study has brought, and still proclaim what is called 'the old gospel'? I believe we can if we mean by the old gospel simply the love of God in Christ. The one thing that is vital is the Deity of Christ. If we believe in that, then we have the assurance that God has broken through to us, that an authentic and final word has been spoken to us from the unseen, and that we *know* what God is and what His purpose and offer of grace are. And I believe that all the creative forces, that have made the new world of thought, conspire to bring this truth into relief, and that, so far from invalidating the one supreme reality, they have served and do serve to enhance and to display the glory and all-sufficiency of the Eternal Son of God, our Saviour and Lord.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

Sleepy-head !¹

'Awake thou that sleepest.'—Eph 5¹⁴.

SOME of you fellows are fairly sleepy of a morning, I'll be bound. They waken you, and you grunt and turn over ; they try again just when you are getting comfy, and you growl out, 'All right, just getting up.' And you really mean it, yet over you go once more. It is not easy getting started. It's like when a man runs round to the front of his motor, and begins to turn the handle, and nothing happens ; and he tries again, but still there is no result ; and he gets red in the face and begins saying things to himself, but tries once more, and this time it starts purring and is ready. It's difficult to get our engine started sometimes too. But for real power of sleep there are not many things to beat a frog ! In summer he is an active little chap ; though even then he is not a restless fidget like you, can sit long enough thinking deeply about who knows what, as solemn as a judge. Yet if you could jump, oh, if only you could jump like him you would win the prizes everywhere, even at the Olympic Games : and all over the streets there would be nothing on the bills except *Aberdeen Boy of Seven wins World Championship*, and when you turned it up there it would be, a long account, telling that you won easily although a little out of form for you, seeing that you only cleared twenty-one feet at the high jump, and managed fifty-four feet three inches at the long. That's what you could do if you jumped like a frog ! But in winter, when the cold comes, he won't have it ; creeps away into a hole or a crack in the rocks, and sleeps for days and weeks and months, and then in spring when we are all tashed and tired and cross with one another after the long winter's work, out he comes as spry as you like. 'Tired,' he says, 'who is tired ?' And hops eleven times his own length. 'I'm not tired ; you ought to go in for a rest cure like me.' And you should. He's right. That is why you sleep at night. Your body is worn out with tumbling about so much all the day long. You were quite certain that you could wait up for Daddy, and yet long before he came your head was nodding and your eyes would not stay open,

and they carried you up and put you to bed and you never knew. But next day you were as lively as ever. The sleep did it. And that's why you get Saturdays and Sundays off. Your brain is getting wearied, jumbled up with parsing and sums and Latin verbs. 'Time to knock off,' they say ; 'you'll be all right again by Monday, better rest your brain a bit.' And if you say, 'Well, but you ministers work on Sundays, what about you ?' the only answer I can think of for that is that it looks as if we were thought to have no brains, and so of course we needn't rest them ! And that's why you get holidays. See that you take a real one. Away with your school books, out with your cycle and your rod and your clubs and your most exciting stories ; these are the things that you want then, to rest you. Oh, the frog is a clever little chap ; he knows ; and he is right.

Only sometimes he overdoes it, that's the bother. There are lots of tales of frogs being found in the heart of rocks ; and there, folk say, they have been sitting all hunched up for millions of years since the rocks were made. That isn't true. What happens is that a frog goes into a hole and sleeps, and while he is doing so something falls and blocks up the entrance, and there he is caught fast where, if there is any air, he can live for a year or so, but not longer, and there he sits and sleeps on till he dies. And when you take a rest you must take care to keep the way out open. It's fine to have a holiday, but when the session comes remember to work then : it doesn't matter very very much if you are a bit careless when you are wee, but now you are getting big. Can you get out ? Can you wake up ? Can you stop that habit of yours of being lazy, or are you shut into it for ever more ? You can still get out, if you try at once ; only remember things are slipping, slipping, slipping down and blocking up the entrance more and more. The busiest man I ever saw is a minister I know. He makes me giddy the way he flies round and round and never rests at all ; he gobbles up work as you do sweets, and keeps asking for more ; I can't think how he packs it all into the day. I remember at a meeting hearing man after man get up and say that it must be stopped, that he was doing three or four people's work, that nobody could stand it. And I sat there with my eyes bulging out of my head, for at school that

¹ By the Reverend A. J. Gossip, M.A., Aberdeen.

fellow used to fall asleep in the Latin class pretty regularly ; and I once saw him get the licking of his life because he snored and we couldn't waken him in time. You can get out yet if you wish. He did. But hadn't you better do it now ? To fall asleep in the Latin class is pretty bad, you know, but there is worse. For we are always in God's class, and He is the kindest Teacher ever there could be, is never cross and always very very patient. And always He keeps teaching us how to be brave and not snivel, and how to play the game and not whine, and how to take knocks and not cry about it. But are you learning, are you even listening ? Why, you are fast asleep, are snoring ! Well, if you are very wee I don't think He minds. I know I don't if you fall asleep in the long sermon. And I think that God when He comes says, ' There were a lot of kindly people there, some of them worshipping earnestly, some of them listening hard, but I think the nicest of them all was a little lassie with a tousley head snuggled up against her mother fast asleep.' But if you are getting big you should listen in God's class when He is teaching us all the day long. Shake yourself. Oh, far harder ! Be firm : be like Mother. She's very soft the first time, and the second time ; but at last she says this won't do, and off go the clothes. And that does it. Off with the clothes, and wide awake with you. It's more than time, you sleepy-head !

For His Name's Sake.¹

' I write unto you, little children, because your sins are forgiven you for his name's sake.'—1 Jn 2¹².

There used to be in Paris, but it was destroyed with a great many other precious things at the Revolution, a great book, in which were written the names of all the towns and villages of France, and opposite their names the taxes they had to pay. Opposite one name there was a strange writing. The name is Domremy, and the writing was, ' Free for ever for The Maid's sake.' What did that mean ?

Long ago France was trampled under English feet. English armies marched up and down at their will and did as they pleased. Half of France was England's and the other half was poor, beaten, and cowed. In Domremy lived a maid called Jeanne. She loved her country and sorrowed for its sorrows. She thought much about it, till one

day she heard voices calling to her. Her soul was ' listening-in,' and the message that she heard was ' France calling,' calling her to save France.

It seemed impossible, and for a time she did nothing and told nobody ; but the voice kept calling in her waking thoughts and through her dreams until she became convinced that it was God's will, and, however impossible it seemed, she must do it. So she left all and went to the king and told her story. Some mocked, some doubted, but some had faith in her and listened. So she gave herself to France, and put a new courage into the soldiers of France. They followed The Maid and her banner, winning back town after town, until at last she saw the king crowned in the great cathedral at Rheims.

The rest of the story is sad enough, for it tells how she was taken prisoner by the English, accused by the Church of being a witch, condemned by the Church of Rome, and handed back to the English to be burned at the stake at Rouen. So she died to save France.

An English soldier said, ' This day we have burned a saint ' ; and soon France came to see it too. The wicked men who had condemned her died in disgrace and were gladly forgotten ; but The Maid's name was restored to honour. The people cherished her memory as a saint ; and in the great book at Paris which recorded what each town and village owed in taxes it was written in gratitude to her that her village, Domremy, was to be ' free for ever for The Maid's sake.'

I know another book in which something like this is written. There is an entry in it which concerns you girls and boys who read this, for it says, ' I write unto you, little children, because your sins are forgiven you for his name's sake.'

What does it mean ? It means something like the story of The Maid, only far more wonderful. It means that there was pity in the heart of God and sorrow in heaven for a poor sinful world conquered by sin and ravaged by evil passions even more sorely than France was harried by the English soldiers. The Lord Jesus heard the need of earth calling and He came as a little child and gave Himself to the world at Bethlehem. And all His life on earth He lived to heal and comfort and teach men to know their Father in heaven, and to help them to win the victory over things evil.

Some mocked, some doubted, some listened and had faith in Him. In the end, He was betrayed

¹ By the Reverend Stuart Robertson, M.A., Glasgow.

into the hands of those who were His enemies, and they tried Him with false witnesses and false accusations, and put Him to death at Calvary. So He gave His life for the world because He so loved the world.

And because of that our sins are forgiven. 'He died that we might be forgiven,' and so St. John could write long ago and we can read to-day, 'I write unto you, little children, because your sins are forgiven you for his name's sake.'

For The Maid's sake Domremy was forgiven its taxes for ever, for the Saviour's sake the world is forgiven its sins; and the one can help you to understand the other.

Now it was shameful of France to suffer The Maid to be left to die, and it was only proper and decent that France should do all in her power to honour her name and show gratitude for the freedom she had won for France, whose saviour she had been. We can all see that; but what about *our* Saviour? Surely we must honour His Name and show our gratitude for all He died to give us. Our freedom is His gift and must be used for His glory. If we sing:

He died that we might be forgiven,
He died to make us good—

we also go on to sing:

O dearly, dearly has He loved,
And we must love Him too,
And trust in His redeeming blood,
And try His works to do.

That is what it all means. To be a Christian means to have a great thankfulness in our hearts to Jesus Christ, because 'we are forgiven for his name's sake'; and a great purpose in our hearts to live henceforth, not for ourselves, but for Christ's sake.

The Christian Year.

SIXTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Law of the Corner.

'Thou shalt not wholly reap the corners of thy field.'—Lev 19⁹.

This commandment runs beyond the bounds of all Judæan tillage, and is a guide for fields where other fruits than yellow grain are reaped.

1. But its primary enforcement, we do well to remember, was in order that there might be pro-

vision 'for the poor and for the stranger.' Religion from the earliest times has made provision for these two classes. And still it stands as the supreme test of a living faith—what it does by way of social amelioration, and what by way of foreign missions. The measure of the gulf between the Divine ideal and the economic state into which we have fallen may be gathered from the difference in the common understanding of the expression 'to make a corner,' and the thought in the mind of God when He ordained the making of a corner in all our sowing and reaping for the poor and the stranger. God approves of making a corner in wheat, only not in the acceptance of that term by the pit and the exchange.

2. But beyond the immediate needs of the poor and the stranger there is in this law provision made for the developing of the man himself who owns or works the field. The tendency to hardness, the desire to scrape the fields of life, is not wise. It does not pay to squeeze the orange dry. There is a danger that in reaching for the fruits of industry even the shrewdest gleaner will overreach himself. 'Bargain sales' are not unprofitable even to the seller. God's method of making a corner has much to be said for it even on the most utilitarian grounds.

Life will yield us in the end a richer increase if we are careful to observe the law of the corner. Many an author who has made a considerable name for himself has succumbed to the temptation to collect for publication his immature and less worthy writings, the fallen fruit of his vineyard, and has damaged thereby his reputation. And, on the other hand, have not really great men enriched the thought and the lives of others by their unconsidered, uncollected *obiter dicta*? Lavishly they gave themselves to their friends in conversation or in advice. They did not always claim a fee for the advice which was freely sought and as freely given. They were glad that others who were not so well endowed as they with brains, or faculties, or any of the precious fruits of life, should glean what they needed in the corners of their large experience.

But the law runs deeper and wider still. It goes through the fields of experience where men are sowing habits and reaping characters. There are some people who always impress you with a sense of reserve power. You feel, as Chesterton has said of Robert Louis Stevenson, that what he gave us 'were only the two or three of his soul's adven-

tures that he happened to tell. But he died with a thousand stories in his heart.' You feel that there are many rich, unreaped corners in the fields of those men. And on the other hand, there are those who make a great to-do bringing in their harvest wain; they are anxious to impress you with the wealth of their golden sheaves. But all the time you are conscious that they have hand-picked every grain there was—that there will be no aftermath.

The secret of so many of the intellectual and moral failures in life is just this, that there has been neglect of the law of the unreaped corner. People anxious for too quick a return on their investment of heart or brain have crowded all their goods into the shop-window, hoping to make an impression on the passers-by, or upon one particular passer-by.

In all true love and in married life there should be a certain reserve. The zest of life and love comes from their being an endless exploration and discovery. The tragedy of many a home and many a friendship is that one therein has greedily thrust in a savage sickle among the fruits of friendship, until the field has been left bare and unproductive, and the soul is starved of love. To respect the personality of others is one aspect of the law of the unreaped corner.

It is the fact of the unreaped corners, too, that keeps the edge upon the appetite for knowledge. Thank God for ignorance, for the virgin corners and bypaths of knowledge which ever provide that lure in learning which is needed to keep our hands from hanging down in idleness. One remembers what fun Lewis Carroll makes of the White Knight who had tried to arm himself against every contingency which might possibly arise. To this end he had loaded down his horse with all sorts of utensils, even adding a mouse-trap and a beehive in case they might come in useful. He had left no corners unreaped, seemingly; and yet, what a pathetic, laughable figure he cuts. The whole joy of the adventure in life is that we should meet contingencies as they emerge, alike with a stout heart and a scheming brain, rising to each occasion as it comes.

The loss and tragedy of the life which has nothing upon which it can fall back have been expressed in Browning's poem, 'Shop.' The poet tells how thrilled he was to find a striking display in a shop-window of many objects of virtue and not a few of worth and interest. What, he thought to himself,

must be the wealth of the man who can put all this on view? Great was his disappointment when he went within and found nothing to correspond to all this promise.

So, friend, your shop was all your house!

Its front, astonishing the street,

Invited view from man and mouse

To what diversity of treat

Behind its glass—the single sheet!

Did he find great reserve stocks of undisplayed goods?

Nowise! At back of all that spread

Of merchandize, woe's me, I find

A hole i' the wall where, heels by head,

The owner couched, his ware behind,

—In cupboard suited to his mind.

And, if life will yield us in the end a richer increase, if we are careful to observe the law of the corner in commerce and in character, we shall find the working of this law most beneficent of all if we let it run into the fields of faith. The unreaped corner, the element of mystery, are vital to religion. There was a moment when the disciples of Jesus were just aching to thrust in their sickle-question, 'and none of the disciples durst ask him, Who art thou?' 'When ye reap the harvest of your land, thou shalt not wholly reap the corners of thy field, neither shalt thou gather the gleanings of thy harvest.' Is it a hard law? God in Christ obeyed that law Himself. 'Now is my soul troubled; and what shall I say?' And He said nothing: He just went straight on in faith.

That is why one is chary of creeds and all cut-and-dried expressions of the faith by which we live—just because they are cut and dried. We have thrust in the inquisitive sickle and maybe reaped the corner where we should have held our clumsy hand. We have made faith less attractive to others, without feeding the hunger of the soul. So long as the corner is unreaped the poor and the stranger may come by and find God's plenty to rub in their own hands in their own particular way.

The more faithfully we are working and developing the high places of the field, the less do we fret over the corners God bids us leave unhusbanded. It is not well with an age that wants to know too much, that is unwilling to respect the Divine ordinance about unreaped corners and ungathered grapes. Is it not enough that we have the revelation of the wine in the cup, without greedily snatching

at the grapes that are withheld? We all love secrets: don't you think God does too? We all enjoy the pleasure of giving surprises: why rob our Father of this pleasure? 'Eye hath not seen nor ear heard'—no, thank God! The reaping of the last dark corners of life will be part of the joy of the Harvest Home.¹

SEVENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Little Drama of the Great Event.

'Jesus, knowing . . . that he was come from God, and went to God; he riseth from supper, and laid aside his garments; and took a towel, and girded himself. After that he poureth water into a bason, and began to wash the disciples' feet.'—Jn 13³⁻⁶.

What does the Lord's Supper mean? men were beginning to ask. This is what it means, at the heart of it, the writer of this Gospel seems to say: it means the condescension of the Highest, the cleansing of the unworthy, the service of the humble by the humble, and of all by each. If we may read it so, we are supplied with a freshening commentary upon symbols and actions which may be almost too familiar.

1. It means, says the Evangelist, being more eager to reach the meaning than to describe external facts already well known—it means *the condescension of the Highest*. Strangely deliberate and majestic is that sentence—'Jesus, knowing that the Father had given all things into his hands, and that he was come from God, and went to God.' One would think that the writer was preparing the way for his supreme assertion of Christ's divinity, but instead, he is preparing the way for his supreme illustration of that spirit of service which ruled in the Master's life and death. The Church of the early generations was very sure who and what Christ was. In those days it was on the whole easier to believe in His true divinity than in His true humanity—so overwhelming was the impression made upon those who knew Him first and best. Clement of Alexandria, for instance, writing about a century later than this Gospel, cannot get away from the astonishment of this passage. 'The Lord ate from a cheap bowl, and He washed His disciples' feet with a towel about Him—the lowly-minded God and Lord of the universe. He did not bring a silver foot-bath from heaven to carry about with Him.' Certainly we are not in the region of silver foot-baths and tinsel dignities here. The Highest is the humblest.

¹ H. L. Simpson, *Put Forth by the Moon*, 53.

That is written all over the Feast of which the Apostle here is thinking, though he does not actually describe it. It is written all over the Cross, which, like the Feast, tells of One who was so great, who came from God and went to God, and who yet showed His greatness by lowliness and His divinity by service.

My starry wings

I do forsake,

Love's highway of humility to take.

2. Another part of the meaning of the Feast is *the cleansing of the unworthy*. When the Master said to Peter, 'If I wash thee not, thou hast no part with me,' the Apostle's mind only played upon the surface of the words. The full revelation of Peter's need came a few hours later when he had fallen and cast himself out into the darkness—when Peter, revealed to himself as a false and cowardly sinner, felt at last in every fibre of his being how his only portion and hope lay in Christ the Saviour. And the full understanding of the manner and cost of his cleansing came perhaps only gradually, under the gentle, patient teaching of the Divine Spirit, and was written down long after; 'Forasmuch as ye know that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, from your vain manner of living received by tradition from your fathers; but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot.' So the secret which was hidden from pride and boasting was revealed to him in utter necessity.

This too is always a part of the meaning of the Feast, and of the Cross behind the Feast. As His people still seek His holy place they bring with them not the dust of Jerusalem streets but the stains of a world's highway—stains that have been doubled and deepened by their own waywardness. It would serve their need but poorly, were He once again with them in visible form, to gird Himself with a towel and wash them with water. He comes to do them a great service—to wash them in the deepest places of their being from their guilt, their sin, their foul tempers, their false motives, all stain of fault and failure and transgression. Never perhaps is the glowing and glorious reality of this transaction so vividly felt as in the act and attitude of communion.

3. The Feast means one thing more—as also does the Cross behind the Feast—it means *the service of all by each*. The Master would not allow

His disciples to escape that lesson. 'Know ye what I have done to you? If I then, the Lord and the Master, have washed your feet, ye also ought to wash one another's feet. For I have given you an example, that ye should do as I have done to you.' They needed the counsel and the example. Some of the other Evangelists are frank enough as to the quarrelsome and ambitious temper in which these men sat down, disputing which of them should be the greatest.

That temper was hard to exorcise, even by those who were supposed to take their spirit from the Upper Room and their pattern from Calvary. Paul had to deal with it again and again in the churches of his founding, beseeching them that nothing might be done through strife or vainglory. And so in the Church of later days. Men talk of socialism—there is no fellowship of equality like that of the Lord's Supper, where all are on a level because all are redeemed; and of brotherhood, but there is no brotherhood so old, so catholic, so permanent as that which was formed round the foot of the Cross, nor is there any so real if men would only live out its meaning. And, according to St. John, its meaning is service. In this atmosphere the worldly motive and the selfish spirit might well droop and die. And those who truly partake are knights of the Grail, who go from the Feast to bear one another's burdens and to heal the wounds of humanity.

Such vision and practice are greatly needed for the health of the Church and the well-being of the world. We see individual greed biting into the body politic, and the egotist often succeeds in persuading his neighbours, for a time at least, to take him at his own valuation. The central inspiration of social life seems to have departed, or to be lost in a mere scramble for place and power. It is the task of Christian folk, and it is not an easy task, to see things from a different angle and to live their lives in a different way. Their motive must not be greed but love, their spirit not egotism but service.¹

EIGHTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

'But whom say ye?'

'But whom say ye that I am?'—Mk 8²⁹.

It is not possible to hold fellowship with any one without reaching some convictions about him.

¹ J. M. E. Ross, *The Tree of Healing*, 132.

And the longer and closer the fellowship, the clearer and more certain the convictions. In accordance with this law, the Christian, holding fellowship with Christ, reached and reaches certain conclusions about Christ.

1. *He is Man.* The New Testament believer first of all held that Jesus Christ was everything that man ought to be. It is probably better at this point to write 'man' than 'a man,' for the conviction included the idea that Jesus Christ is the ideal for every man. He did not appear just to be 'the ideal carpenter,' or 'the ideal Rabbi,' or 'the ideal Jew,' but 'the ideal man.' He was in the realm of history what the Platonic 'ideal man' was in the realm of thought. The believer found Jesus to be 'the ideal man.' Here is another of the places where the interdependence of the 'historic Jesus' and 'the risen Christ' is clear. For the early believer could not so have thought of the unseen Christ, with whom he had fellowship day by day, unless the 'historic Jesus' had lived the life of which the Gospels tell.

2. *He is 'Son of Man.'* The first believers drew a second conclusion from their fellowship with Christ—that He holds a unique relation to the whole human race. One of the New Testament writers expressed this on one occasion by calling Christ 'the second Adam'; another named Him 'Priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek'; while the earliest narrators of His life on earth told that He used to call Himself 'the Son of Man.' The first believers knew that Jesus Christ was not merely the Saviour of a series of individual men, but the head of a new human society,² and of a new society that ought to include, and must continually seek to include, all mankind. There were the beginnings of this society in the Church. It was to reach its perfection in the Kingdom of God. However imperfectly or even vaguely the early Christian conceived what is now called the 'solidarity of mankind,' he had such a concept, and he found himself bringing Christ into a given relation to it.

3. *Who knows Him knows God.* By fellowship with Christ the disciple learnt a third truth, this time about both Christ and God. The 'man of religion' always and everywhere is a man who knows something about God, and wants to know more. He has, and has had, many teachers, who teach both by what they say and by what they are.

But he exhausts them all in turn, except One. The most devout Buddhist looks for another and better Buddha; the fanatical Muhammadan expects a Mahdi who will surpass the earlier Prophet; even the Jew looks for a Messiah who will 'fulfil' the Old Testament, and, fulfilling, pass beyond it. But the Christian, from the first, has always believed that in Jesus Christ there is the final and sufficient revelation of God. This does not mean that Christ leaves no unsolved mysteries in the concept of the Divine nature, but it does mean that He has told men all that they need to know about God in order that they may live and live 'abundantly.' Again, while it does not mean that the Christian has no more to learn about God, it does mean that what he has still to learn will be learnt through Christ, and not through any other. In one way this conviction is impossible of proof, and it is true that in it the element of faith is peculiarly obvious. Yet the Christian has the same kind of ground for his belief about Christ in the future that other men have for other beliefs about the future. To return, he believes that what Christ is, teaches finally what God is. There is here again small need to gather evidence from the New Testament. It has often been collected. A few phrases that sum up the belief may be quoted. Two of the more 'philosophical' New Testament writers use metaphors. John, recalling that persons mirror their characters in their speech, calls Jesus 'the Word' of God; the writer to the Hebrews says that He is to God as the ray to the sun or the stamp to the die. Paul's characteristic phrase is here simpler: 'The God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.' The Synoptic writers are content with the name 'The Son of God.' The implications of such phrases need not be discussed just here. It is clear that the men who used them believed that, knowing what Christ was, they knew what God was, and knew this in an unequalled and unsurpassable way.

4. *He is God.* Yet this is not all. It is conceivable that men might, through fellowship with Christ, enter into fellowship with God. At least at first, this is what Jesus' disciples felt they were doing. He 'knew the Father,' and therefore He was the one to 'teach (them) to pray,' and prayer is fellowship with God. But gradually the disciple came to see that his experience meant more than this. He found that his fellowship with Christ

was itself none other than fellowship with God. It was not enough to say—to borrow again the phraseology of the book that best sums the findings of the first believers—that Christ is 'the way' to the 'Father'; it was true that 'he that has seen (Christ) has seen the Father'; that '(Christ) and the Father are one.' Even if the discourses of the Fourth Gospel do not belong word for word to the Master Himself, at least they reflect the thought of a thinker in the early Church, and of a thinker whose account of Christ was accepted as accurate by his fellow-Christians. The first believers found that to know Christ was to know God.

It is not wonderful that the Christian Jew, in particular, with his staunch monotheism, only gradually reached the assertion, for it is still impossible fully to solve the 'mystery' that it raises for the monotheist. Slowly, however, the first believers found themselves creeping towards it, urged on by a necessity that they could not control.

'The Word was God.' How satisfactory this explanation proved, even to rigid monotheists, appears from the nature of the first heresy, Docetism. This arose so soon that its beginnings may be traced in the New Testament itself. It was a first attempt to solve the problem how a single person can be both God and man. And it proceeded, not by mitigating the claim that Christ was Divine, but by suggesting that He was not really man! His human life was not more distant than the life of Wellington is to-day, yet the Christian found it easier to deny His humanity than His divinity. The latter seemed the more certain to the believer because of his living experience of the living Christ.

The four assertions—that Christ is Man, Son of Man, Son of God, God—ensue from the study of New Testament experience. Yet this does not cease here to be 'normal' for later Christians. It would be difficult to enumerate, and impossible to solve, all the problems that arise from the four assertions. But, in spite of all the difficulties—indeed, even when bewildered with the difficulties—the Christian 'witness' has remained the same. Men have gone on knowing Christ. They have entered into His fellowship. As they have done so, they have made the old new discoveries about Him. The Christian to-day still says: He is Man; He is 'Son of Man'; who knows Him knows God; He is God.¹

¹ C. Ryder Smith, *The Christian Experience*, 126.

NINTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Fairness of Trial.

'There hath no temptation taken you but such as man can bear; but God is faithful, who will not suffer you to be tempted above that ye are able; but will with the temptation make also the way of escape, that ye may be able to endure it.'—1 Co 10¹³ (R.V.).

The word 'temptation' is sometimes used to express the general discipline of life, and, again, it is employed to signify allurements to evil. We now use it in the latter sense, and design to show that such temptations are so regulated as to leave us no reason for complaint. We are apt to assume that we have cause to complain that temptation is often excessive, that it is of such a character and force as to be practically irresistible. On the contrary, we desire to make clear that the tests to which our moral life is submitted are never excessive, never out of proportion to our potential strength, never without the way of escape. 'God is faithful,' and every trial of our faith or principle, our temper or conduct that He permits, is reasonable, and such as we may endure and master. It is never of such character as necessarily to baffle us by its subtlety, to overwhelm by its intensity, to surprise by its novelty, or to exhaust us by its frequency. Let us consider this.

1. The *subtlety* of temptation is often pleaded in extenuation of a fall.

Beccari in his book, 'In Great Forests of Borneo,' describes the fascination of the pitcher plant. 'It cannot be doubted that insects must be attracted towards the pitchers of the *Nepenthes*, considering all the artifices and inducements brought into play—the strange shapes of the pitchers, their bright colours, and, above all, the glands disseminated around, affording all kinds of sweetmeats, to tempt and lure the insects to perdition. Of this kind are the glands which are in the inner part of the lid of the pitcher, where, if a greedy and imprudent insect tries to rest, it is almost certain to be trapped. But where Nature has shown all her refinement of perfidy is in the disposal of those baits within and around the rim of the pitchers. All the ornamental appendages, grooves, enlargements, rings, points, etc., found there, have no other end than the leading the insects toward the lower inverted portion within these appendages, where is a gland secreting nectar, placed in such a position that if an insect reaches it, it almost certainly loses its balance and falls into the well prepared to receive

it. Once in there, it cannot escape, and is drowned in the liquid.' The natives call these plants 'Satan's Jugs.' Are we, then, to conclude that the temptations of human life are of a similar infernal complexity, and that we are ensnared by devices of confounding ingenuity? It is not so. For the most part the temptations of men are simple enough, obvious enough.

To the Corinthians St. Paul writes: 'That no advantage may be gained over us by Satan: for we are not ignorant of his devices' (2 Co 2¹¹). This saving knowledge may be ours habitually. The astutest diabolical invention is transparent to the sincere. 'The depths of Satan' are shallows over which the pure in heart pass dryshod. Generally speaking, we walk into the snare with our eyes open.

2. The *intensity* of temptation might be excessive, and justly provoke protest. If objects of extraordinary beauty or greatness, of preciousness or enjoyment, were dangled before our senses until our imagination was kindled, our heart agitated, our passions inflamed, much might be urged on our behalf when we failed in the trying hour. And temptation is often pictured as though it were thus dazzling. Very much indeed of this presentment of evil is overwrought, causing the morals of society to suffer through the debauched imagination. Emerson's verdict on these imaginary spectacles and descriptions is entirely just: 'The order of things consents to virtue. Such scenes as luxurious poets and novelists often paint, where temptation has a quite overcoming force, never, or very rarely, occur in real life.' The temptations which work the ruin of tens of thousands are utterly destitute in themselves of any special grandeur, glory, beauty, or delight. They are usually commonplace, and frequently mean and coarse. There is no need to spread a Belshazzar's feast to excite the appetite; a mess of pottage will suffice.

3. The *novelty* of temptation might furnish an apology for moral failure. Were we ambushed by subtle foes of whose treachery we had no warning, or subjected to solicitations of which we had no previous knowledge, or circumvented by methods without parallel, or shipwrecked on some uncharted rock, we should have something to say for ourselves in the hour of humiliation. But it is not so. As Archer Butler puts it: 'We are the easy prey of every commonplace illusion, vanquished by the novelty of seductions which were old in the days of Peter, and John, and Paul.'

The very fact that the temptations to which we are ordinarily subjected are usually commonplace may in itself constitute a peril. If they were rare, and of an extraordinary character, they would provoke attention and reflection, and so be better understood; but, arising as they do out of the ordinary relations and routine of life, exciting no special attention or emotion, we are in danger of treating them with indifference, contemptuousness, presumption. But for all their familiarity it must be kept in mind that they are not the less malignant.

4. The *frequency* of temptation might wear down the strongest, and so provoke protest. We can bear only so much according to the frailty of our nature, and it would do us manifest injustice to exceed this strain. Yet we may rest assured that no such protest will be called for. Revelation repeatedly assures us that Heaven works by weight and measure, and that when duly tested there shall be laid upon us 'none other burden.' It is true that our whole life is a period of probation, and that our fidelity is being constantly put to the proof; but the severe struggles are rarely repeated.

'And when the devil had completed every temptation, he departed from him for a season. And Jesus returned in the power of the Spirit into Galilee.' What was true of the Master is true of the disciple. It is often surprising how far one clear, sharp, signal moral victory goes toward settling the controversy as to our final triumph.

In a day of deep distress, Millet, the French artist, wrote to a friend: 'Let us pray Him who gives us intelligence not to abandon us too much, for we have need of all our strength to accomplish this task.' He will not abandon us too much; He will not abandon us in any sense. But we must never diminish the vigilance with which we need to guard against temptation. Each one has the utmost need of solicitude, seriousness, preparedness; need for all our wit and strength, as Millet discerned. Whilst our temptations are substantially the same as those to which men have been subjected in all generations, they have a novelty of their own as times and circumstances change. We are told that coral reefs are not to be looked upon as simple stationary structures, but as living, moving things, ever changing their form and aspect. Vessels are constantly being lost upon coral reefs in different parts of the world, owing to the inaccuracy of their charts. There is abundant evidence to show that charts of coral

reefs made one year are almost valueless twenty years afterwards. Much the same is true of the moral dangers of life. Ancient in character, they constantly emerge in special forms and original disguises, giving no place for presumption, calling for habitual awareness, lest we make shipwreck of faith, conscience, character, and hope.¹

TENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Failure of the Brook.

'And it came to pass after a while, that the brook dried up, because there had been no rain in the land. And the word of the Lord came unto him, saying, Arise, get thee to Zarephath, which belongeth to Zidon, and dwell there: behold, I have commanded a widow woman there to sustain thee.'—1 K 17⁷⁻⁹.

Where this brook Cherith was, we do not know exactly. It was one of the little tributaries of the Jordan. Somewhere in the uplands of the south it had its rise, and it chattered as it flowed to join the brimming river. It is notable that its name means 'separated.' It was the lonely, separated burn. Here, then, at the beginning of his career, the prophet Elijah was sent apart by God. Like Moses in Midian, and like Jesus in the wilderness, God drew him into isolation for a season. For very rarely does God plunge His servants into the stir and dust of the great battle without a call to a period of quietude when they can take their measurements in silence.

Elijah, then, was sent to the brook Cherith by the express commandment of his God, and it must have been a strange and staggering thing for him when the waters of the brook began to fail. Had he been fugitive from duty, it would have been very different.

What was the meaning of the drying up of the brook?

1. The failure of the waters was meant to deepen the prophet's sense of brotherhood. He was drawn into a new fellowship with Israel in the very hour that Cherith ceased to flow. For it was a time of drought. Everywhere drought and cruel pangs of thirst, and men and women entreating God for water—and all the time, in the little vale of Cherith, the coolness and the murmuring of the stream. It was very comfortable, and it was very happy, but it is not thus that Jehovah makes His prophets. And so, that he might be a brother among brothers,

¹ W. L. Watkinson, *The Fairness of Trial*, 9.

and feel his kinship with his suffering nation, it came to pass after a while that the brook dried.

'Arise, get thee to Zarephath,' said God, 'for I have commanded a widow woman there to sustain thee.' Elijah trusted God's guiding, and went to make his strange request. He is almost ashamed to make the appeal. He brings it in as a kind of afterthought. Yet the woman rises to the appeal of faith and love which somehow Elijah awoke in her, and brought him into a little fellowship in which the problem was solved and the famine was kept at bay. The secret is, that through faith and love they had made a circle through which God could work. And to-day nothing will meet the complexities of our modern world but the deeper qualities of our nature called into play and working in fellowship. That is the message which is ringing through our land to-day, and we are all coming to see it. All sorts of people, disillusioned and baffled by selfishness and brought to a standstill, are demanding a new adventure of goodwill and industry—the spirit which sees beyond the shadow of a man's own narrow life into the lives of others.

2. Again Elijah was taught by this event that in certain matters God makes no exceptions. God has His chosen ones, but whatever they be chosen for, it is not to escape the heritage of tears. By the very grandeur of his office there was a certain distance between the prophet and the ordinary man. And, therefore, it was reasonable to expect that the prophet would have a little special care, and would be guarded, as the favourite of God, from some of the ills that flesh is heir to. But here, by the drying up of the waters of the Cherith, Elijah learnt that, though he was God's messenger, he was not going to escape the common lot. One of the hardest lessons we must learn is that the name and nature of our God is love, yet, for the man who trusts and serves Him best, there is to be no exception from trial. Think of Peter, on whom the Church is built. When we open the door of his cottage there is fever there. Think of Mary, mother of our Lord, and what is that in her heart?—it is a sword. Think of the home at Bethany that Jesus loved—surely no blast of the chill wind will pierce that dwelling?—and it came to pass that their brother Lazarus died.

3. The ceasing of the prophet's brook was the beginning of larger views of God. 'Arise, get thee to Zarephath,' said God. There in Zarephath, as Elijah viewed the superstition, and realized the

moral death which followed it, there was burned into his heart the loathing scorn that made him such an antagonist of Baal. But Elijah learned more at Zarephath than that. He learned there was a wideness in God's mercy. He saw that the God of Israel could be gracious to a woman who was born and bred a heathen. And to a Jew like Elijah, trained in the Jewish creed, and, believing that beyond the covenant was darkness, the thought that the mercy of God was for the heathen came with the thrilling of a great surprise.¹

4. But the ceasing of the prophet's brook was a message, above all, of the need of deeper resources than the surface world can supply, and of the call to trust them.

So it is with us. As life goes on, the brook dries up. Take our human affections, and the love which makes life rich. People find their happiness in each other's company and set up a home together. They have common interests; the world is good to them; and life goes along smoothly and pleasantly for a while. But the time comes when things are more difficult. They have to meet strain together, or health is not so robust, and tempers become peevish, or the surface attractions fade. The brook dries up. What happens then? They drift apart, and we call it misunderstanding, or a misfit, and the human problem becomes the subject of Royal Commissions, and the theme of the realistic novel or the shallow play. But the real root of the trouble is spiritual. Love and friendship are of God, and they cannot be sustained apart from Him and the faith and unselfishness which are the deeper currents of our being.

The same thing holds true of service and philanthropy. It is easy enough to be kind and charitable when things are going well. There are moods when a kindly spirit seems to be in the air. We become well disposed to other people; social service becomes the fashion. But dull times come. People we try to help grow uninteresting, sometimes disagreeable, and sometimes they are blind to our motive and our goodwill. The very people for whom Christ poured out His heart's blood turned at last to crucify Him. He had a time of popularity, when they gathered about Him with cheers and wanted to make Him king. But the brook dried up. Have we ever had that experience? If so, had we resources enough to carry us through?

The same is true of what we usually call the

¹ G. H. Morrison, *The Wings of the Morning*, 108.

Christian life. There are moments when it seems easy enough to follow Christ. We have resources in ourselves for what it seems Christ wants us to do. The example of others or the common decencies of life carry us through the ordinary temptations. When the kindly faces are round us, it is not so difficult to be true. But the brooks dry up. What then? When things go against us, and the kindly faces are gone, or when we go to a strange land or some great city, where we are flung into a maelstrom of unbelief, and things we were taught to hate

begin to speak to dim instincts in the blood, and there is a quiet smile for the man who takes religion seriously, what then? Or when we come up against the cruel facts of life and our faith begins to burst into question marks, what then? Then we must strike deeper into the resources of our faith, or perish. We must find a vision of God big enough to meet the big problems or make us willing to accept perplexities. We must face the question whether Christ is a reality we can trust all the way.¹

¹ J. Reid, *The Victory of God*, 238.

Accent and Emphasis.

BY J. RENDEL HARRIS, LITT.D., LL.D., D.D., BIRMINGHAM.

WHEN my friend Dr. Mingana was recently travelling in Mesopotamia, he was called upon to explain where he came from, and when he replied that he was from Manchester, his answer provoked no sign of intelligence in those who were questioning him. This was strange, for Manchester and its products are better known in the Far East than London itself. Our fabrics are in the bazaars in Samarcand, and if Keats spoke of 'Silken Samarcand' with the understanding that the products of Chinese industry had come to the West that way, we might equally be entitled to speak of it as 'Cotton Samarcand.' Why, then, did not the Mesopotamians understand? At last it dawned on them: 'Oh! you mean Manchestér!' It was the change in the accent that caused the perplexity, and they would have been equally puzzled if the Doctor had used the original pronunciation and said Manchéster.

Recently talking with a Greek in his own language, and taking every pains to speak with good accent and discretion, I found myself subject to frequent criticism and correction: 'We accent thus and thus, and not as you say, so and so.' It was a theme in which I had tried to be perfect and ended with repeated apologies for imperfection. After that it was easy to understand what would happen in one's own tongue if the stress accents were removed or thrown about in any way and at random. If you were to take a modern Roman missal or service-book you would probably find every word accented visibly: it will not be sufficient to prevent the operator from saying *mumpsimus* where he

should have said *sumpsimus*; he must also be secured from saying *sumpsimus* instead of *sumpsimus*. The virtue goes out of the formula when the accent is misplaced.

What *accent* is in the single word, *emphasis* is in the sentence. Misplace it and a different meaning supervenes than what is intended; one has to protect oneself by devices such as a change of type in print, or an underlining in script, or similar tricks. Illustrations, again, are hardly necessary. One can try the misplacing of emphasis on any familiar piece of prose. How should one pronounce, 'It is *I*, be not afraid'; or in the sentence, 'The very hairs of *your* head are all numbered,' where the Greek pronoun is emphatic. In the case of poetry, the emphasis is usually protected by the metre. For example, when we recite the verse,

How sweet the name of Jesus sounds,
the metre throws the unimportant
how—the—of

out of the stress accents, and leaves the important words under metrical emphasis. One must not, however, be too much in bondage to metre; emphasis is lord even of metre: we do not say,

The bóy stood ón the burning deck,
but,

The bóy | stood | oñ the burn | ing deck.

So when we recite, 'In a believer's ear,' we have to lengthen the first syllable and say, 'In ã bēliever's ear,' and then it is clear that the emphasis is on

'believer's,' and not on the indefinite article. In the same way we were recently singing,

Walk in the light, so shalt thou know,

which ought clearly to be recited or sung as,

Walk | in the light, | etc.

Now let us turn to the Christian religion. It may be defined in one way as a change of accent, in another as a change of emphasis. The difference between the gospel and the Law is just that; or we may say, it is an alteration from Law in the direction of Grace.

Personal religion in that case becomes a change of emphasis. Take St. Paul's presentation of his own experience: he had been under the law to Moses, he became under law to Christ; but the law of Christ was grace; it was a yoke lined with love into which the believer willingly inserted his neck. St. Paul's own neck had been grievously chafed by his efforts to wear a yoke that never fitted him and had, in fact, been made for him before he was born; the yoke first and the neck afterwards.

The pious in Israel were putting emphasis on Law. 'Moses in the Law says,' but 'What is this that you are saying, Jesus?' And they not only emphasized the simple code of ten masterful inhibitions, but they expanded them into a number of lesser precepts. For instance, if last Saturday they had seen me taking out my handkerchief, they would have made me an offender for bearing burdens on the Sabbath, and have told me to have my handkerchief sewn on to my coat and so made part of my dress. And I have little doubt that Paul in his burdensome days had his mother fasten his handkerchief on to his jacket. As we know, he was earnest to keep the Law in its minutiae, and thought he had done it. Hence I have compared him in athletic language to an athlete who has to take a flight of ten hurdles, and who took nine of them successfully and came down on the tenth; as he puts it, the Law slew him; he had not known himself to be sinful if the Law had not said, Thou shalt not covet. And there was St. James, acting as referee on the race-track that day, and remarking sarcastically that it doesn't matter which hurdle you come down at; the result is the same as if you had come down at all ten!

Now look at the change of emphasis that is made by Jesus and His apostles. They may be Jews still, but they are anti-Judaic: Jesus takes a

positive pleasure in breaking the Sabbath in all kinds of possible ways before serious people: sometimes He wrapped His criticism up in pieces of paper torn out of the Old Testament history, or from the pages of the prophets. 'Did you never read what David did when he was hungry?' 'How do you explain this prophetic formula, "Mercy and *not* sacrifice."?' It is clear from this last illustration that it was Jesus Himself who was altering the accents and removing the emphasis. Sometimes He appealed to natural law as against codified precepts, and insisted that doctors did not (even on a Pharisee's showing) have to keep the Sabbath, nor the milkman, nor even the priests with the daily sacrifices, etc. etc. These instances from a single rule which had become a burden, show that Jesus was the direct ancestor of Paul, and not, as some persons have supposed, that the dependence was in the opposite direction.

As for Paul himself, he had to break loose definitely from the thought of a legal obedience. The Law was become his positive enemy. He was in the toils of it, like Laocoon in the story and in the statuary, where he and his sons are coiled round with the encirclings of hideous snakes. He fought with Moses, and declared that his Law which couldn't be kept was not a blessing, but a curse; and proved it out of the Law itself. Then when he had at last wrestled his last fall with Moses and thrown him, he made the prostrate body of an ineffective code the jumping-off place into Christian Grace and its satisfaction Godward and manward, and just as the ancient Greeks had the myth that Apollo once came down and wrestled with a monstrous python and slew him, and then put a garland of victory upon his head and sang a pæan or victor's song; so the apostle has his own pæan: you will find it in the opening of Ro 8: 'There is, therefore, now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus. . . . For what the law could not do (in providing righteousness, that is to say), God in Christ has done and does.' How is that for a pæan? Or this, 'I am persuaded that neither life nor death,' etc.; or this, 'Thanks be to God, which giveth us the victory.' Every Christian heart becomes part of a chorus to the Apostle.

Then there is another direction in which he found a change of emphasis. After all, there is a sense in which the antithesis between Law and Grace does not appeal to us as it did to the theologians of the Reformation period or to the Judæo-Christ-

tians of the first century. St. Paul has another antithesis which makes a more direct appeal: there is the I and the not-I; the self-life and the Christ-life. One may throw off legalism and not reach sanctity, or even replace it by another legalism; so we find another struggle for a higher emancipation. When St. Paul wrote his great letter to the Galatians, which is all for freedom and is in itself a Christian Magna Charta, he struck a deeper note than anti-Judaism could do; he talked of death with Christ, and life in Christ; said that he lived no longer, but Christ lived in him, and some

other deeply moving words about some one who had loved him and given himself for him. The 'I' was gone, and the 'not-I' had come.

When my dear friend Dr. Forsyth was on his death-bed and I went to see him, when speech had become difficult and the panting breath was not far from the last effort of a failing heart, he said to me in Latin, and kept repeating, 'Dilexit me, dilexit me; oh! that beautiful Vulgate version!' The 'not-I' was at the death-bed of the 'I.'

Oh! but they say the tongues of dying men
Enforce attention like deep harmonies.

Recent Foreign Theology.

German Theology.

LUTHER is better known by his Table Talk than by his Sermons. A good opportunity to make his acquaintance on the latter side is furnished by the volume entitled *Predigten D. Martin Luthers*, edited by Georg Buchwald and published by Bertelsmann, Gütersloh. This first volume contains the sermons preached between 11th October 1528 and 3rd April 1530, and also a valuable preface which discusses the salient characteristics of the sermons. Occasionally a longer or shorter series is preached: there is a series of ten, for example, dealing with the Catechism, and shorter series preached at Christmas and Easter. Besides attesting the almost incredible industry of the man, these sermons, marked by Luther's well-known vivacity and by a wit homely sometimes almost to the point of coarseness, yield many an interesting glimpse into his inner life, and especially his life as a monk. A debt of gratitude is due to the evangelical Lutheran synod of Iowa, U.S.A., whose liberality made possible the publication of this volume.

An excellent little sketch of the history and the present position of foreign missions is presented by Dr. K. Heilmann in the seventh edition of *Die Aeussere Mission* (Bertelsmann, Gütersloh). Brief though it be, it is admirably calculated to stimulate interest in missions, accompanied as it is by a large mission map of the world and by forty-six pictures which strikingly illustrate many phases of

the missionary enterprise and of life in heathen lands, such as idolatry and the slave trade.

To the series of New Testament investigations, edited by Professor Otto Schmitz, has just been added a volume by Lic. Wilhelm Michaelis, *Die Gefangenschaft des Paulus in Ephesus* (Bertelsmann, Gütersloh; M.6). Starting from a close examination of the journeys of Timothy, he seeks to establish an Ephesian imprisonment of Paul, and argues that this is the period to which the letters to the Philippians, Colossians, and Philemon ought in all probability to be assigned. One result of Dr. Michaelis' investigations is to bring all the extant letters of Paul within a period of six years or so, and therefore to discount the divergences in outlook which have been held to subsist between these letters and which are usually interpreted as signs of development in his theology. This fresh and unconventional study deserves serious consideration.

Six lectures on some letters of the early Christian Church, delivered last November by Dr. Adolf v. Harnack at the University of Münster, have been published by the Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, Leipzig, at M.4.50, under the title *Die Briefsammlung des Apostels Paulus und die anderen vorkonstantinischen christlichen Briefsammlungen*. The successive lectures discuss the letters of Paul, Ignatius, Dionysius of Corinth, Origen, Cyprian, and Dionysius of Alexandria. All these letters were important in their day, and some of them, especially those of Paul, Ignatius, and Cyprian, far beyond

it: indeed, the letters of Paul are beyond question the most influential collection of letters in the literature of the world, and it is fitting that Harnack should devote more space to this collection than to any other. The lectures are alive at every point, and they illustrate Harnack's power to combine fine scholarship with a vividly human presentation. Students, whether of church history or of epistolary literature, will welcome the volume, we trust and believe, with so unmistakable a cordiality that Harnack will be encouraged to continue the discussion in a subsequent volume, as he proposes to do if there is an adequate response to this one.

In the series dealing with the Greek Christian writers of the first three centuries the eighth volume of the works of Origen has just been published, under the meticulously careful supervision of Professor W. A. Baehrens (*Origenes Werke*, achter Band: Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, Leipzig; M.28.80 geh., 32 geb.). This volume contains—in the Latin, translations of Rufinus and Jerome, together with the very few Greek fragments that are extant—Origen's homily on 1 S 1. 2, on the Song of Songs, on Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel, and the commentary on the Song of Songs in which Jerome thought that Origen surpassed himself as much as in his other books he surpassed other commentators. The text, which is beautifully printed and accompanied by an elaborate *apparatus criticus*, is preceded by a preface which discusses the various manuscripts, the history of the text, and cognate matters. In this volume everything has been done that finished scholarship and careful typography could do to facilitate the study, on the homiletic side, of the greatest Biblical scholar of the early Church.

In three volumes Professor Oskar Holtzmann proposes to give a conspectus of the whole of the New Testament, which will take the form of a new translation and a running commentary. The first volume of this, *Das Neue Testament übersetzt und erklärt* (Töpelmann, Giessen, M.9.50), has appeared; it includes Mark, Matthew, and Luke, in this order. The aim of the writer is to keep the busy minister and the educated layman, who have not time to study elaborate commentaries on individual books, in touch with all that is vital in recent investigation, and also to leave on their minds the impression

of the New Testament as a whole. This volume is eminently fitted to fulfil such an aim. There is no parade of learning. Dr. Holtzmann goes straight to the point, concentrating on issues of real moment. The commentary is not only readable but interesting; it could be read with pleasure as well as with profit by any educated man who was interested in Christian origins.

An interesting and valuable discussion of the four Gospels, both in their individual quality and in their relation to one another, is presented by Professor Wilhelm Larfeld, in *Die neutestamentlichen Evangelien* (Bertelsmann, Gütersloh; M.14 geb.). The literary problem of the Synoptic Gospels is clearly set forth, and very special attention has been given to the language, vocabulary, and style of the New Testament, the characteristics of the *Koine* being discussed, also the Hebraisms, Aramaisms, Latinisms, etc., and peculiar grammatical constructions. The style, language, text, and historical attitude of one Gospel are compared with those of another; and the Fourth Gospel is compared with the Synoptics, in respect of its additions, divergences, and aims, and of its portrait of Jesus. Those who are interested in literary and linguistic questions will find much information and stimulus in the section on The Style and Language of the Synoptics, which occupies nearly half the book. Dr. Larfeld insists on the impression of unity, beneath all difference, created by the various Gospels in their conception of the Person of Jesus, and he has the courage to maintain that His life is sketched in the Fourth Gospel with more historical fidelity than in the other three.

A second edition of Archbishop Söderblom's *Das Werden des Gottesglaubens* (Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, Leipzig; M.12.50 geh., 14 geb.), somewhat briefer than, but substantially the same as, the first edition published ten years ago, has just appeared. It deals in a singularly comprehensive way with the historical development of the idea of God, which it traces from the conceptions found in the religion of primitive peoples right on to those of the higher religions, such as the ancient religion of China, of India, of Persia, and of Israel. An immense material drawn from widely different fields, ethnology, missionary enterprise, etc., has here been laid under contribution, and the result is to make us feel our kinship in the deep

things, despite our differences, with primitive man. Biblical students will turn with eagerness to the chapter on The Deity as Will, in which the Old Testament development is traced. Not the least attractive feature of this noble book is that it is written by a man to whom religion is not merely an object of scientific investigation, but a living reality.

The little book on the Evangelical Conception of a Saint (*Der evangelische Begriff eines Heiligen*, Ratsbuchhandlung L. Bamberg, Greifswald) embodies the speech delivered by Archbishop Söderblom at the University of Greifswald, in recognition of the threefold doctorate with which he had been honoured by the Faculties of Theology, Medicine, and Philosophy. It is in part a criticism of the Roman Catholic polemic against the Indian mystic, the Sadhu Sundar Singh, though he fulfils, as truly as any canonized saint ever did, the conditions laid down by Pope Benedict xiv. as the pre-requisites of beatification and canonization. But the Archbishop goes on to point out that the danger for the Protestant is to rest content with commonplace morality and to lose sight of the obligation to heroic achievement. The true saint is he who shows by his life that the power of God is working in him.

We can well believe that to the book which Rabbi Ziegler has written on *The Moral World of Judaism*¹ he has, as he puts it, 'dedicated every fibre of his heart.' It is a very earnest book, written to bring his co-religionists back to a knowledge of the moral treasures enshrined in the Old Testament, of which, he deplores, many of them nowadays know so little. He discusses the material under six heads—the mission of Israel, Israel's idea of God, God and man, man and man, man and the animals, and peace; and these heads again are fruitfully sub-divided, under the fourth, for example, falling such subjects as the ethical decalogue, the family, love of neighbour and enemy, right and justice, economic life and social life; and each of these again is so sub-divided as to cover the ground exhaustively—under family life, for example, coming marriage, woman, chastity, children, education, etc. Professor Ziegler's plan is to print all the relevant passages on the left page, with the German translation on the right, and to

preface each collection by an interesting essay which discusses every phase of its contents.

Only passages relevant to modern life are quoted, but it will be a surprise to most people how abundant they are. Such a book as Proverbs furnishes naturally a particularly large proportion, but they are drawn from every part of the Old Testament, and one gets a fresh conception of the immense moral power and earnestness of the Hebrew Scriptures. The chief constituents of Israel's religion, Dr. Ziegler tells us, are worship, prayer, the study of the Law, and brotherly kindness, and he impressively argues that morality, however noble, unless it has a Godward direction, is not religion—the moral world is God's world.' It is a very comprehensive and useful study of the higher morality of the Old Testament.

For 'Opferfreudigkeit' on p. 62 read 'Opferfreudigkeit,' for 'nennen' on p. 70 read 'nennen,' and for 'Erscheinung' on p. 138 read 'Erscheinung.' For בעלה on p. 170 read בעלה (Pr 31¹¹), for חרד on p. 190 read חרד (Dt 16²⁰), and on same page, before 16, 20, read V.B.M., for חרר on p. 212 read חרר (Eccl 5³), and for ילדיהו on p. 266 read ילדיהו. Curious and interesting slips are the following: חשן on p. 84 for חשן (Pr 3⁵), נגש on p. 118 for נגש, and חרפה twice on p. 218 for חרפה (Pr 16^{28, 30}).

The text of Job has tempted scholars as much as its interpretation has tempted exegetes, and the latest contribution to this intricate problem has been made by Professor Houtsma.² Nearly every verse comes under his scrutiny, and his suggestions lack nothing in boldness. One of his principles is, for example, that frequently words and whole verses have strayed far from their original context, sometimes even into another book: he believes, for example, that Pr 23³⁵ should follow Song 3³. In view of this radical attitude to text and context, it is curious to find how brief are Dr. Houtsma's notes on the celebrated passage 19²⁵⁻²⁷. He begins by telling us that vv. 23-27 are not in their proper place, but that that place is difficult to determine—perhaps between vv. 3, 4. The whole of v. 26 should be deleted as a mistaken transcript of vv. 25b, 27a: וואהרן=ואהרן, עפר=עפר; the פ of this word reappearing in נקפו, whose נקי is the remains of יקום,

¹ *Die sittliche Welt des Judentums*, von Prof. Dr. J. Ziegler (Verlag von M. W. Kaufmann, Leipzig; M.5).

² *Textkritische Studien zum Alten Testament*, von M. Th. Houtsma (Buchhandlung E. J. Brill, Leiden, Holland; fl.3).

only **אשר (אנ) v. 26^b** having been added. In **אשר (אנ) v. 26^b** and **אחזה לי=אחזה אלהו ומבשרי**. The text of v. 27 is correct, except that the last three words do not belong to their present context, but possibly to that of 17⁷. His comment on 31³⁷ seems rather wooden: 'Job does not need to tell God the number of his steps, for God knows them and indeed has counted them already (14¹⁶),' and the last half of the verse is 'too bold.' But surely nothing is too bold for the daring author of this wonderful book. Whether we accept or reject Professor Houtsma's suggestions, however, they are stimulating in no small degree and constitute a real contribution to the study of the text. _____

It is seldom that a philosophical argument is conducted with the lucidity which characterizes Professor Stange's discussion of the immortality of the soul.¹ The study is largely historical, ranging all the way from the ideas of primitive peoples to modern spiritism, and including brief but trenchant discussions of Plato's *Phædo*, Aristotle, the Aristotelianism of the Middle Ages, Descartes, Leibniz, Materialism, Idealism, etc. Stange emphasizes the large agreement subsisting between modern spiritism and the beliefs of primitive peoples, and with the arguments of ancient and modern philosophers he contrasts the New Testament faith in immortality. His final conclusion is thus expressed: 'The fact that one life is long and another short but expresses the truth that duration of time is of no decisive significance. The only thing of decisive significance is whether or not in the period of our earthly life we have come into contact with God—on that hangs the hope of our participation in eternal life.' _____

Professor Will, of Strasbourg, has written a very comprehensive book on Worship,² in which he deals both with its history and also with the religious ideas underlying its three great types, Sacrifice, Mystery, and Prayer. Fundamental questions are raised as to the *raison d'être* of worship; for example, is it adoration or edification, or both? And the discussions are marked by a wide knowledge of the relevant literature, English and American, as well

as French and German—James, Fosdick, and Hodgkin, for example, being quoted. Dr. Will agrees with those who maintain that the prophets attacked not merely the abuse of the sacrificial system, but the system itself. Under the interesting section on Mystery, he remarks that Paul transformed primitive Christianity into a mystery religion, and that this transformation was an historical necessity and even providential. It was not, however, a mere copy of the mystery cults of the East. 'The work of Paul is the fruit of a religious experience resting essentially on the gospel of Jesus Christ, but conditioned in its form by an anterior tradition.' Baptism and the Lord's Supper are historically considered, and even the Quaker 'sacrament of silence' finds mention. The rôle of the liturgy, and the motive and content of public prayer are carefully discussed, and indeed every element of public worship, preaching, Bible reading, singing, benediction, etc. A high tribute is paid to the influence of Luther on congregational singing, and to that 'treasure of extraordinary richness,' the German chorale. Besides being a mine of information, the book will help its readers to define to their own minds the meaning of public worship as a whole and in its constituent parts. JOHN E. MCFADYEN.

Glasgow.

Apologetics in Germany.

THIS book³ is interesting as showing that the Christian Church in Germany is not wholly given up to 'unbelieving' criticism and 'rash' speculation, as is supposed by some amongst us, but that it has a living concern in the Faith, and is keenly exercised about the practical problems of Apologetics, especially in relation to the working classes. In the province of Westphalia great energy is being shown by the pastors in bringing the facts of Christianity before the people, and one of the expedients employed is the annual holding of a *Weltanschauungswoche*, a week's meetings dealing with various views of life and the world—a 'philosophy week' (so to translate the compound, most inadequately), just as our own churches sometimes hold a mission week. This book is in fact the 'Transactions' of such a conference (1924). [It

¹ *Die Unsterblichkeit der Seele*, von Professor D. Carl Stange, Göttingen (Verlag von C. Bertelsmann, Gütersloh, M.4., geb. M.5.50).

² *Le Culte*, par Robert Will (Librairie Istra, 15, rue des Juifs, Strasbourg; 60 fr.).

³ *Apologetisches Jahrbuch 1925*, herausgegeben von J. Müller, Schwefe, Westphalia (Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann).

begins with two explanatory papers by the editor, and contains, besides a summary account of the meetings, four of the leading addresses in full. For us, perhaps, the most relevant of these is Dr. J. W. Schmidt's discussion of the Christological views of the Dialectic Theology, a statement and a criticism, showing that the theology of Crisis and Paradox is no more congenial to orthodoxy than it is to the so-called philosophical religion of the idealists.

ALEXANDER GRIEVE.

Glasgow.

The History of Religions.

THE fourth enlarged and revised edition of the *Lehrbuch der Religionsgeschichte*,¹ founded by Dr. Chantepie de la Saussaye, is now complete. It is a storehouse of information, up to date and trustworthy, but it is also a series of monographs, each containing the mature judgment of an expert on many obscure questions in the history of religions. The editors have been successful in obtaining the collaboration of scholars who are eminent specialists in the subjects upon which they write.

To the list of distinguished contributors² announced at the outset of the undertaking, the name has been added of the Rev. Canon J. A. MacCulloch, D.D., Bridge of Allan—a tribute to the position of authority he has gained by his books on Celtic Religions and Mythology, and by his erudite articles in Hastings' *ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS*. The chief characteristics of the Celtic religion are briefly summarized as 'the preponderance of Nature-deities; their cruelty as evidenced by their offering of human sacrifices; the simplicity of worship celebrated in groves rather than in temples; the power of the priesthood; the universal practice of magic; and the intense faith in immortality.' In the section on *Kultstätten* it is explained that the Druids had temples of a simple kind, in which sacred utensils, spoils of war, etc., were stored, and that under the Romans temples and shrines were erected modelled on Roman designs. But there is no proof that Celtic islanders worshipped in temples unconnected with sacred groves. Religious

rites were celebrated on hills, but 'it is a mistake to think that stone-circles, as, e.g., Stonehenge, were Druidic temples.' In Dr. MacCulloch's judgment the existence of totemism amongst the Celts is uncertain, but they were familiar with, and influenced by, ideas out of which elsewhere totemism did arise.

The article on 'Islam' is contributed by Professor Dr. C. Snouck-Hurgronje of Leiden, whose two volumes on 'Mecca' appeared nearly forty years ago; five volumes of his 'Collected Writings' were published in 1923, and he is the author of an illuminating chapter on 'Islam and the Race Problem' in 'The Moslem World of To-day,' edited by Dr. J. R. Mott. In the comprehensive Bibliographies reference is made to 'the many excellent articles in Hastings' *ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS*.' The well-deserved comment on R. A. Nicholson's 'The Mystics of Islam' is 'especially to be recommended.' All the translations of the Koran are said to 'oscillate between attempts to give a version on a historical-critical basis, and to reproduce the catholic Mohammedan exposition.'

Stress is laid on the interdependence, in the history of Islam, of politics and religion, State and Church. 'Islam came into the world as a political religion,' and has been distinguished throughout its career by its 'catholic instinct.' Individuals and groups have engaged in doctrinal strife, branded each other as heretics, and even accused each other of unbelief, 'but as soon as the heat of passion subsided, there was mutual recognition, and the contention never led to excommunication.' The organization of the community was political, not hierarchical. 'To how great an extent the majority will tolerate heresy, of which the political edge is blunted, has been revealed, in our own time, in the case of the Aga Khan, the head of an Ismailite sect in India. Often he took upon himself to speak as the representative of the entire Moslem world; he had a special liking for European society and published articles in English journals; nevertheless, he was idolized by his admirers.' The abolition of the Caliphate by the Young Turks is regarded as chiefly affecting British India, though in other places there are Pan-Islamic movements which only its restoration will satisfy. 'The proposed union is, however, essentially political, and religious only in so far as Islam, from its origin until now, has been a political religion.'

A lengthy section, entitled *Das Gesetz*, shows that

¹ Herausgegeben von Alfred Bertholet and Edward Lehmann. In zwei Bänden, pp. viii, 756; and viii, 732. M.38, geb. M.52 (Verlag von J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), Tübingen).

² THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, xxxvi, 178 and 427.

a result of the political character of Islam is its legalism. The manifold Moslem regulations are discussed by one who has intimate acquaintance with their details. In the chapter on 'Dogma' a parallel is drawn between Islam and Christianity. It was the upspringing of heresy which, in both religions, led to the formulation of doctrine. 'Each heresy begot one or more articles of faith.' An instructive account of the numerous questions, in regard to which disputes have arisen between the Islamic sects, leads to a full and appreciative description of the mediating action of Al-Ghazali (1111), 'the reviver of religion,' who strove to assign to each of the rival factions its place and its task without disparaging any of the different points of view.

'Islamic Mysticism' is the subject of the last section. Erotic mysticism, which was nothing more than 'a euphonic description of libertinism,' is sharply distinguished from ethical mysticism with its ascetic practices, and from speculative mysticism. As regards the origin of mysticism in Islam there have been many and diverse opinions. 'The main influence has, at different times, been ascribed respectively to Christianity, Hellenism, Manichæanism, Buddhism, Hinduism, and Parsism.' With all these religions Islam came into contact. The philosophic tendencies of Sufism are held to be undoubtedly of Aristotelian-Platonic origin. But Sufism has its own, 'naturally allegorical exegesis' of the Koran, which leaves scarcely anything remaining of the original sense. Mysticism in Islam has been the means of uniting manifold spiritual tendencies. 'In Sufism we encounter puritanic or ascetic piety together with sensualism, the most passionate love of God with pessimistic scepticism, the crudest superstition with pantheistic speculation.' Not only are these opposing world-views represented in the mystical theories of Islam, but often they meet in the honouring of the same religious heroes. There are Moslem poets who seek 'to cover a libertine world-view with the mantle of Sufism. . . . Sufist poetry is also a means of elevating the mind above the cares of material existence.' There are many pious Moslems to-day who esteem highly both law and dogma, and yet they consider that mystical union with the Supreme is the ultimate goal of their life.

Bertholet—has published a most informing lecture delivered by him last July at a missionary conference in Göttingen. The theme is *Modern Islam*.¹ The study is limited to Islam as a religion, though it is fully recognized that the word has an important political, sociological, economic, and cultural significance. The popular conception of Islam as 'fixed, unchangeable, and incapable of development' is examined in detail and shown to be contrary to fact. Westermann refers to a Lebanon Emir who 'worships to-day in the mosque, to-morrow in the church, but is, at heart, a pagan.' Bertholet affirms that such an one is by no means a rarity. Recent statistics estimate the number of Muhammadans as two hundred and one millions, but sixty millions are described as 'Muslims merely in name, whose religion, though tinged with animism, is predominantly pagan.' Islam is caricatured when it is represented as a uniformity.

Amongst the topics with which Bertholet deals are the position of woman, tolerance, modernism, power of assimilation, attitude towards war. His judgments, though expressed tersely, are always supported by the evidence of experts. Stress is laid on the mysticism of Islam as a 'prominent present-day trait.' Theoretically Israel bans everything that is novel or original, but its progressive elements cannot be ignored. Muhammad himself repealed regulations of the Koran; to-day no fewer than two hundred and twenty-five are said to have been abrogated (Simon and Nöldeke). Agreement is expressed with Goldziher's statement that to-day Muslim theologians do not slavishly adhere to the letter of the Koran, but claim the right, in their expositions, to exercise independent judgment. Bertholet concludes by referring to Renan's false prophecy that the nineteenth century would see the end of Islam. Truth is found in the dictum of a Muslim seer: 'Men more closely resemble their times than their ancestors.' Not the least valuable feature of this instructive work is an appendix which gives one hundred and eighty-five references to the copious literature.

J. G. TASKER.

Leamington Spa.

¹ *Die gegenwärtige Gestalt des Islams*, von Alfred Bertholet, Professor in Göttingen (Sammlung gemeinverständlicher Vorträge, 118. Tübingen: Mohr; Rm. 1.20).

Contributions and Comments.

The Christian Doctrine of the Godhead.

WITH regard to your generous appreciation of my book, *The Christian Doctrine of the Godhead*, may I offer two remarks:

1. I should be deeply grieved if the quotation you give of an adverse judgment on Dr. Denney's position on one question were to give the impression that I do not value very highly the contribution of that great theologian and (if I may add) that great Christian, to the interpretation and vindication of the Christian gospel. The other references in my book show either indebtedness or agreement. In dealing with his last book I describe it as 'the latest contribution of primary importance on the subject.' I should feel very highly privileged indeed to follow in his steps.

2. I use Rev 13⁸ in the two references in a literary and not a dogmatic sense, as expressing in the fittest language at command what I believe to be the truth, but not as a proof-text. Were I basing this doctrine upon the very words, I should have felt it my duty to discuss what is 'the correct translation of the true reading.' I am not convinced that we should connect 'from the foundation of the world' with *written* and not *slain*, although I have a great respect for the judgment of a scholar such as Dr. Moffatt. But even if this construction were alone legitimate, the truth would be implicit, if not explicit, in the statement. If the names are eternally written in the book of life, the sacrifice through which their salvation is effected is also in the eternal purpose.

ALFRED E. GARVIE.

London.

'My Testimony':

A MISTRANSLATION IN MATTHEW xvi. 18,

SUSPICION has been directed against the praise of Peter (Mt 16¹⁷ⁿ.) chiefly because of the word *ἐκκλησία*. It is true that *σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα* has been also a cause of stumbling. Bacon, for instance, claims that Matthew's 'addition borrows the very language of Gal 1⁶, and its whole motive is to give to Peter's apostleship a Divine authority at least equal to that claimed by Paul.'¹ In answer to

¹ *Jesus and Paul*, p. 162.

this view we may quote Allen: '*בשר ודם* is very common in the Talmud and Midrashim as an expression for humanity as contrasted with God; cf. *B. Berakhoth*, 28^b "a king of flesh and blood," contrasted with "the King of kings," "the fear of flesh and blood" contrasted with "the fear of heaven."'² It is, however, the mention of *ἐκκλησία* that has led most frequently to the rejection of these verses as unauthentic. 'The preaching of Jesus was concerned with the Kingdom of heaven; the conception of the *ἐκκλησία*, on the other hand, was introduced by Paul (as moreover the *ἐκκλησία* of God, not yet of Christ), as also was the image of building (1 Co 3¹⁰, Eph 2¹⁹ⁿ).'³ Let me suggest an emendation, in virtue of which vv. 17, 18 can, and should, be retained.⁴

In the *Expositor* for June 1916, Dr. Bernard explained the passage in the light of Mt 7²⁴⁻²⁷ (the story of the houses built on sand and rock), and argued that *πύλαι* is a mistranslation of an Aramaic word for 'storms' or 'floods.' Though interesting, this seems unnecessary; for 'gates of Hades,' while an unusual phrase, is nevertheless found several times in the Old Testament and elsewhere. Indeed, the fact that the text was not assimilated to the well-known passage to which Dr. Bernard refers might be adduced as proof of its genuineness. Now 'gates of Hades' does not mean 'powers of evil,' as is generally understood, but 'death.' Study of the passages mentioned will confirm the judgment that 'in the O.T. the "gates of Hades (Sheol)" never bears any other meaning (Is 38¹⁰, Wis 16¹³, 3 Mac 5⁵¹; cf. Ps Sol 16²); so "the bars of Sheol" (Job 17¹⁶, not LXX). It is synonymous with "gates of death" (Ps 9^{14 (13)} 106 (107)¹⁸, Job 38¹⁷).'⁵ Loisy therefore interprets the passage thus: death prevails against all men, but it shall not prevail against the Church (*ibid.*). But it is not quite clear how death in its usual sense could be said not to prevail against an *ἐκκλησία*. This objection, together with the feeling that it is an an-

² *I.C.C.*, 'St. Matthew,' p. 176.

³ Holtzmann, *Komm.*

⁴ Whatever the source of v. 19, it is brought here in accordance with the habit of the Matthaean editor of grouping material. The reason for its position at this point is its supposed connexion with *ἐκκλησία*.

⁵ A. H. McNeile, *The Gospel according to St. Matthew*, p. 242.

achronism on the lips of Jesus, has convinced me that it was something else of which He spoke over which death would have no control.

We do not have to look far to discover an Aramaic word that could have been misunderstood and translated ἐκκλησία.¹ That it was עֵדָה is corroborated by what we find in the Peshitta, both here and in Mt 18¹⁷, namely, ܥܕܬܐ or ܥܕܬܐ. But while עֵדָה means 'assembly' or 'Church,' a word identical with it even to the pointing, עֵדָה, means 'testimony' or 'witness.'² Fuerst in his *Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon*, p. 1016, has an alternative that appeals, namely, עֵדָה 'unveiling.' It occurs in the name יהוֹעֵדָה 'Yahweh is the unveiling, i.e. He unveils' (1 Ch 8³⁶). The word used by Jesus should have been translated not ἐκκλησία, but μαρτυρία, which stands in the LXX for עֵד, עֵדוּת, in Ex 20¹⁶, Dt 5²⁰ (17), Pr 25¹⁷, Ps 18 (19).³

That Jesus' word should have that rendering is borne out by the following considerations:

(i) The Synoptic context says nothing that can be related to ἐκκλησία, whereas it says much of testimonies: e.g. in Mk 8²⁸ and parallels, the opinion of the people regarding the rôle of Jesus is presented; in Mk 8²⁹ and parallels, the testimony of Peter; and in Mk 9³¹,³⁸ and parallels, Jesus' own witness concerning His person and task.

(ii) Jesus at once testifies concerning Himself that He is the Son of Man who in spite of death would return in heavenly power. Jesus' appearance as a teacher—a novel rôle for the Messiah—made the recognition of His Messianic claim to be a matter of real, Divinely-prompted insight. Could He be expected to refrain from bursting into a joyful speech at Peter's confession and from making a revelation of Himself in return? 'When Peter in his confession at Cæsarea Philippi said, "Thou art the Christ!" Jesus, while admitting the correctness of Peter's answer, went on to say, "The Son of man must suffer many things," etc. (Mk 8²⁹⁻³¹), and similarly

on a later occasion when the High Priest asked Him, "Art thou the Christ, the Son of the Blessed?" He answered, "I am, and ye shall see the Son of man sitting at the right hand of the power," etc. (Mk 14^{61, 62}). The substitution of the latter title for the former must be due to its more heavenly character and thoroughgoing adaptation to Jesus' thought of His own office. Thus, while Jesus was the Christ, and at last confessed it publicly, it was in a higher sense than that in which the term was commonly understood.'⁴

(iii) The immediate context in Matthew also necessitates some testimony on the part of Jesus. καὶ ὁ, the opening word of v.¹⁸, must not be passed over as insignificant. 'It probably represents the emphatic position of the pronoun in Aramaic.'⁵ It indicates that Jesus' action is to be closely linked to that of Peter. It can hardly signify anything else than that Jesus, like Peter, has a revelation to make.

(iv) A basis is secured for the Johannine habit of Christ referring to His own witness, e.g. Jn 5³¹ 8¹⁴.

The passage in the light of these reasons should read as follows: 'And Jesus answering said to him, Blessed are you, Simon Bar Jona: for flesh and blood did not reveal (it) to you, but my Father who is in heaven. And I in turn tell you, that you are Peter, and upon this *petra* shall I build my testimony, and the gates of Hades will not prevail against it. . . . And he began to teach them, that the Son of man must suffer many things, and be rejected by the elders, and the chief priests, and the scribes, and be killed, and after three days rise again. . . . Whosoever shall be ashamed of me and of my words in this adulterous and sinful generation, the Son of man also shall be ashamed of him, when he cometh in the glory of his Father with the holy angels' (Mt 16^{17b, 18}, Mk 8^{31, 38}).

The objection may be raised that it is unusual for a person to speak of 'building' a testimony or witness. In answer let me say two things: first, that the idea of building a testimony is found in the Old Testament, e.g. in Ps 119¹⁵²: 'Of old have I known from thy testimonies (עֲדוּתֶיךָ) that thou hast founded them (יְסֻדָּתָם) for ever'; cf. v.⁸⁹.

¹ I am indebted to Dr. McLaughlin and Professor Potter of Victoria College for information regarding Aramaic possibilities.

² Dalman, *Wörterbuch*, p. 293.

³ See J. Moffatt, *Approach to the New Testament*, p. 34 f.

⁴ W. Manson, *The First Three Gospels*, 71 f.

⁵ S. H. Hooke, *Christ and the Kingdom of God*, p. 81.

Second, that the mention of 'rock' and 'witness' is natural in the light of such O.T. passages as Jos 24²⁷ 22³⁴, Gn 31⁴⁵⁻⁴⁷.

Peter's confession is termed a *petra*, a *kêphā* in Aramaic, because that word furnished a play on Peter's name and because for Jesus it provided a foundation-stone upon which could be based His testimony, His revelation. C. CLARE OKE.

Toronto.

The Muhammadan Name of Jesus.

It is well known that Isa stands for Jesus in Muhammadan circles, and it might be considered merely a corruption of Ἰησοῦς were it not that we have an entirely different view advanced by the Muhammadans themselves. Al Baizawi considers it to be equivalent to the Hebrew *Ishu* and derived

from *al'ayas*, 'white mingled with red.' Whatever may be the value of the Muslim scholar's philological observations, his conclusion is interesting. He gives no explanation why Isa should mean 'white mingled with red.' May we suggest that we have here another example of the Dioscurization of Jesus? Whenever the twin cult appears, red always stands for the thunder, and is not infrequently associated with white, which Dr. Rendel Harris considers must represent the lightning. If this explanation of the note of Al Baizawi is sound, may we not expect to discover further traces of Dioscurism in the Muhammadan Christ legends? Moreover, the presence of it, even in this single case, seems to reveal that for some at least of the Jesus legends of Islam, the followers of the prophet are indebted to Syrian sources. E. J. JENKINSON.

Didsbury College, Manchester.

Entre Nous.

Self-Expression.

It is well that Dr. Inge has written a preface to *The Inescapable Christ* (Murray; 6s. net), for without this it is just possible it might have been passed by. Why? In the first place, because its author, the Rev. Walter Russell Bowie, is an American and is therefore not so well known to us on this side. And secondly, because this is a popular book, and it may be that there is a slight misgiving in our minds about some of the popular books which have come to us from America. Though this book is written in a clear and popular style and is not intended in the first instance for scholars, there is adequate scholarship behind it as well as a thorough knowledge of human nature and all the special problems with which men are faced to-day.

In one chapter Dr. Bowie deals with the demand which the present generation is making to live its own life in its own way. In order to throw light on the meaning of self-expression he considers the personality of Jesus. 'The first thing we know about him was that he deeply knew himself. He had a way of praying much. He would go out into solitary places and there commune with his own soul. . . . Then presently he took this self of his which he had apprehended and began mightily

to express it. He knew his own thoughts, was sure of his own convictions. When he spoke, he spoke with a power before which the poor, little, wavering, unreal opinions of ordinary men made way. . . . They were amazed at him, the record tells us, "for he spoke with authority, and not as the scribes."'

'As thus he spoke with the authority of an outgoing independence, so also he lived. There was no range of experience into which he did not enter as though it belonged to him. Life, with all the infinite zest and beauty of it, flooded through his spirit in full tide.' 'As he touched life widely, so he touched it deeply. It was impossible to ignore him.' 'At length he had so projected himself into those who loved him that the authentic witness of his spirit shone about them. In the early days of the Church at Jerusalem, when Peter and John were arrested and brought before the Sanhedrin, men "took knowledge of them that they had been with Jesus."' 'If we are seeking for grandeur of self-expression, is there anything in all the history of our world which compares with this? Here was one in whom there dwelt a life so prevailing that, not only his immediate environment, but the far-reaching energies of innumerable other lives became the projections of himself;

and yet the strange thing was that this illimitable victory came out of immediate defeat.'

This, then, is the way in which Jesus found the freedom and fullness of life. Can the religion of Jesus give to the youth of to-day the self-expression that it is seeking? The first thing that it must do, Dr. Bowie says, is to learn from Jesus to look within, 'and through thought and prayer and long communion to understand the meaning of their souls.' But real self-expression involves a further step—the going forth to find that larger self which belongs to us in the life of others. The 'thing, which some call the herd instinct and some call the social instinct, which all students of human personality recognize, religion lifts into the beauty of its own clear ideal.' 'It is the spiritual truth that no man liveth unto himself and no man dieth unto himself.' 'I can never forget,' says Dr. Bowie, 'a man at whose side I stood as he lay dying after the battle of San Mihiel. He was a sergeant in command of a party mending the wire between the lines. The party was fired upon, and he was mortally wounded, was brought in by his companions, the rest of them coming through unscathed. The only thing he said about it all was this, "I certainly was proud that none of the other boys got hurt." His life was a larger thing than his own existence.'

'There was self-expression and self-expansion which had learned some of the secret of the life of Jesus.' 'There is a glimmer of the Christ in us which reaches out to identify itself with holy loyalties, to increase those forces in the world which make for wonder and for worship, to claim its brotherhood with all other lives that need the inspiration of his help. Until we find that life of Christ within us and let it go forth through us, we have never found our self-expression. If we save our life for less than he would have it be, we lose it. Only as we lose it in the thought of him, we save it mightily.'

A Question of Principle.

Woodrow Wilson's career is often cited to illustrate defects of character that grow from delicate physique in childhood and consequent inability to join in the more vigorous team games. Mr. William Allen White, one of the most distinguished writing editors in the United States, goes so far as to say in his biography of Wilson, of which an English edition has newly appeared, that his unwhipped cubdom gave him at times a kind of imperious puerility.

At college the President-to-be's society made him its debater and staked its fame upon him. But in the final he drew from the hat a slip appointing him to take the Protectionist side in a tariff debate. He would not speak against his principles, and tore up the slip, to the chagrin of his side. Having accepted the rules of the contest, should he not have played out the game? It is a question of conscience: Wilson always prided himself on having torn up the slip and foregone college oratorical honours for a principle.

An Encourager.

Yet Wilson could spur on a team to unexpected achievements. Wesleyan University, Middletown, Connecticut, of which he was a professor, once came close to defeat at football with Lehigh. Then suddenly from the Wesleyan spectators, a man walked out in front clad in heavy rubber boots and a raincoat. He shouted to the Wesleyan supporters, reproaching them for not cheering their team, and began to lead them in the Wesleyan yell, beating time for them with his umbrella. He continued this violently. The heartened Wesleyans turned the tide of the game, and drew level. After the game the Lehigh men asked who was the magnetic cheerleader. He was the Professor of history, Woodrow Wilson. 'Well,' said the Lehigh men, 'he is all right, for he saved you.'

'It was not possible.'

Messrs. James Clarke & Co. continue to add to their excellent series on the Great Festivals of the Church. The two latest volumes are *Easter Sermons* and *Ascension and Whitsuntide Sermons*. Each volume contains about a dozen sermons by representative preachers, including Dean Inge, the Bishop of Birmingham, Dr. G. H. Morrison, Dr. Norman Maclean, and the Rev. James Reid. The volumes are edited by Mr. Frederick J. North (5s. net).

In the *Easter Sermons* volume, Dr. Maldwyn Hughes, the Principal of Wesley House, Cambridge, has a short study on Ac 2²⁴. '*Because it was not possible*. That is a stupendous assertion,' Dr. Hughes says. 'Peter does not say simply that Death did not hold Christ, but that it could not hold Him'—a bold statement in regard to death in the world, in view of the fact that countless generations have gone to a 'bourne whence no traveller returns.' What Peter says of Jesus is

in effect, 'it stands to reason that death could not hold Him.' "Alpha of the Plough," in one of his essays, tells of a soldier whom he met in the days of the War, who was obsessed by the belief that Kitchener was still alive, and would yet come to his country's aid. "I can't never believe that he's dead," he said. "I can't do it. No, I can't believe it. Stands to reason." It is an inadequate illustration. And yet it suggests a great deal. Peter could not think of Jesus as dead. 'He does not say, "Jesus is alive. I have seen Him." No, he says, "Jesus is alive. It stands to reason that it was not possible for Death to hold him."'

There is a sense in which no good man ever dies, for death cannot quench the torch of a great spirit. 'The story of our race is the story of its great men. If you are going to tell their story, it is not enough to recount the things they said and did and were while here on earth. You must go further and tell of the influences which they have left behind them.' 'The Hebrew Prophets passed from off this mortal stage many centuries ago, but it is absurd to think of them as conquered by Death. They are still sources of influence and of inspiration.' 'Their words are not mere echoes from a dead past; they are instinct with life and energy and power.'

'This is true of Jesus Christ in a supreme degree and in a unique sense.' His influence lives on in the world. But that is not all. *He Himself* lives on in the world in *personal* presence and power. 'The early Christians preached Jesus and the resurrection.' 'Their first concern was not to make men assimilate the moral precepts of the Sermon on the Mount, but to make them realize that Jesus was alive and would enter into a redeeming and abiding fellowship with them. We are puzzled that Paul seems to say so little about the moral demands of Christ and so much about life "in Christ Jesus." But after a time we begin to understand that Paul was right. If we live in fellowship with Christ we shall have the mind of Christ, and we shall understand what is His will, and we shall have strength to obey.'

'This is the inmost secret of the Christian life. Jesus lives. It was not possible for death to hold Him. He is the Christ who reigns on high and He is Christ in us "the hope of glory."'

'The world,' Dr. Hughes says, 'is continually bearing unconscious testimony to the reality of the living presence and power of Jesus Christ.' 'The

American Methodists have erected a statue of Francis Asbury, the great apostle of American Methodism, among the great men of their nation, outside the Capitol at Washington. The figure of the flaming evangelist will be a constant reminder to the American people of the imperishable things of the Spirit.' Why do we not erect statues in our public places to Him who is the inspirer of every great prophet and apostle, even our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ? Because it stands to reason. We do not erect statues of the living. Jesus is here.

'It was not possible for Death to hold Him. His tomb was empty. Every tomb in which He is buried is empty. The tombs in which men bury the noble causes inspired by Him are empty. And, if we cling fast to Him, our tombs will be empty. All things will be ours—life and death, the present and the future, height and depth, because we are Christ's and Christ is God's. "It stands to reason."'

'But in our Lives.'

'*But in our Lives*,' by Sir Francis Younghusband (Murray; 7s. 6d. net), is a story founded on fact. That it is in some sense biographical only adds to its interest. Sir Francis knows his India well, and there are thrilling descriptions of the forests and the hunting of big game. He is the sympathetic friend of the hero who lives a soldier's life on the Indian Frontier, and reshapes his life by the prayer 'that we may show forth thy praise, not only with our lips, but in our lives.' '*But in our lives*' gives the title to the book. Many are the risks and high ventures of the hero, but he does valiantly. There is an interesting description of a mystical experience he had—what we might call his conversion, how he was suddenly permeated with an overpowering spirit which seemed to force its way into every fibre of his being. He was remarkably composed and collected, very much indeed himself, and full of power. And he had an extraordinary sense of having been cleansed through and through. Above all, he was inspired with a tremendous impetus to do.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.